The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

Volume VI, Number 3

July, 1944

Published by

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

CONTENTS

The Gospel for Pentecost 259
Rev. Richard Kugelman, C.P., S.T.L., S.S.L.

"El Gibbor" 276
Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

St. Augustine's Defense of the Hexaemeron against the Manicheans 289
Rev. John P. Maher, O.S.A., S.T.L.

The Prophecies on Holy Saturday 299
Rev. William J. Lallou, S.T.D.

The Form-Critics, the Gospels, and St. Paul 306
Rev. Stephen E. Donlon, S.J., S.T.D.

Sheol in the Old Testament 326
Rev. Clement J. McNaspy, S.J., M.A.

The Real Heart of St. Paul 334
Rev. Werner Hannan, O.F.M.Cap.

"Axios" in the Gospels 342
Rev. James A. Kleist, S.J., Ph. D.

Missal Epistles from Romans 347
Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

Obscurities in the Latin Psalter, XXII 353
Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

Correspondence 357

Biblical News 361

Survey of Periodicals 365

Book Reviews 370

Synopsis Evangelica, John Prado; *A Harmony of the Gospels*, Newton Thompson. STEPHEN HARTDEGEN, O.F.M. 370

Mater Ecclesia, Joseph C. Plumpe. MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J. 371

The Thrill of Tradition, James Moffatt. WILLIAM A. DOWD, S.J. . 372

The Ladder of Progress in Palestine, Chester C. McCown, PATRICK W. SKEHAN 375

Contemporary Thinking about Jesus, an Anthology. A. C. COTTER, S.J. 376

Joshua, Roger MacVeagh and Thomas B. Costain. JOHN A. STEINMUELLER 378

The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Penteteuch, Charles T. Fritsch. MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J. 378

Daily Life in Bible Times, Albert E. Baily. EUGENE SERAPHIN, O.F.M. 379

THE GOSPEL FOR PENTECOST (Jn. 14:23-31)

REV. RICHARD KUGELMAN, C.P., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Pentecost is the Birthday of the Church, the anniversary of the day on which God breathed into the Mystical Body of Christ the breath of divine life, the Holy Spirit, who is "her soul."[1] On Pentecost Christ fulfilled His promise of sending the Holy Spirit, and the Church began her public life.

> The Church . . . first showed herself before the eyes of men on the great day of Pentecost. On that day the Holy Ghost began to manifest His gifts in the mystic body of Christ, by that miraculous outpouring already foreseen by the prophet Joel. . . Then the Apostles "descended from the mountain," as St. John Chrysostom writes, "not bearing in their hands tables of stone like Moses, but carrying the Spirit in their mind, and pouring forth the treasure and the fountain of doctrines and graces."

Since the Feast of Pentecost commemorates the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Church, the Gospel assigned for the Mass of this day is appropriately a passage from our Lord's discourse at the Last Supper, containing His promise of the divine Spirit's mission.

The Gospel for Pentecost (Jn. 14:23-31) may be divided into three sections:

(1) Jesus' Response to St. Jude: 23-24.
(2) Jesus' Promise of the Holy Spirit: 25-26.
(3) Jesus' Farewell: 27-31.

I. JESUS' RESPONSE TO ST. JUDE: 23-24

In the preceding pericope Jesus said, referring to His death: "Yet a little while and the world no longer sees me" (Jn. 14:19). For the comfort of the Apostles He hastened to add that they would see Him, since He would return to life. Moreover, He will manifest Himself to everyone that loves Him (20-21). "Judas, not the Iscariot, said to him: 'Lord, how is it (i.e. what has happened, *τί γέγονεν*) that thou art about to manifest thyself to us, and not to the world?" (22) The first section of the Pentecost Gospel is our Lord's answer to this question of St. Jude.

Prompted by reverence for the holy Apostle, St. Thomas

[1] Leo XIII, Encyclical letter "Divinum Illud," (1897) Eng. trans. Catholic Truth Society, London, p. 11.

Aquinas charitably attributes Jude's question to his deep humility. He admonishes us to remember:[2]

It is customary for saints and humble people to be amazed and filled with wonder, when they hear great things about themselves. Now the disciples heard the Lord saying: Yet a little while and the world no longer sees me; but you will see me etc., from which He was seen to prefer the Apostles to the whole world. And therefore Jude, with wonder and amazement, says: Lord, what has happened, that thou wilt manifest thyself to us? As if he would say: What will be the cause? Are we, then, above the whole world?

This interpretation is a tribute to the Angelic Doctor's devotion to the Apostles. But it supposes in St. Jude a degree of disinterestedness, a holy indifference, which at this stage of his spiritual development he did not possess. Jude, like the other Apostles, shared the ideas of his Jewish contemporaries concerning the nature of the messianic kingdom. The Messias was to be above all a national savior. His glorious manifestation to a wicked world was to be an essential element of his mission. He was to be a warrior king, subjecting all nations to Jewish hegemony.[3] The messianic hopes entertained by the Apostles before Pentecost were pithily expressed in the remark of the two discipls on the way to Emmaus: "But we were hoping that it was he who should redeem Israel" (Lk. 24:21). As late as Ascension Thursday, the Apostles eagerly questioned Christ: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:6). Jude's question, therefore, was prompted not by humility, but by chagrin, by disappointment. His Master had said: the world will see me no more; I will manifest myself to those that love me. What, then, was to come to Israel's hopes? "Lord, how is it that thou art about to manifest thyself to us, and not to the world?"

23. *Jesus answered and said to him, "If anyone love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our abode with him."* As so often in his recorded replies, our Lord answers Jude's question not directly, but by repeating and developing the statement which occasioned the question.[4] Not only will Jesus love and manifest Himself to

[2] Thomas Aq., *In Evangelium S. Ioannis Commentarium*, cap. XIV, lect. VI, 1.

[3] Cf. G. E. Ganss, S.J., "The Messianic Ideas of Jesus' Contemporaries," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, VI (1944) no. 1, pp. 40-46.

[4] E.g., Jn. 3:5-8; 4:14; 6:43,44.

those who love Him, He and His Father will come to such and dwell with them. He also indicates the reason why He will not manifest Himself to the world. The world does not love Him, since it does not keep His words: *He who does not love me does not keep my words* (24). "Love," writes St. Augustine,[5] "separates the saints from the world."

Our Blessed Lord's answer must have given great comfort to Jude and his fellow Apostles, and gone far to allay the disappointment they felt at hearing Him say the world would no longer see Him. Post-exilic Judaism felt keenly the loss of the *Shekinah,*[6] God's special presence, which had been the glory of the Tabernacle of the Wandering and of the Temple of Solomon. "And they shall make me a sanctuary, and I will dwell in the midst of them" (Ex. 25:8). Yahweh confirmed this promise by manifesting visibly His special presence among His chosen people by the cloud that hung over the tabernacle in the desert and that filled the temple of Solomon on the day of its dedication.[7] By no such miracle had God graced the Second Temple. So the Rabbis list the *Shekinah* among the five graces of the first temple, which were wanting in the Second Temple.[8] Yahweh, however, had promised that He would resume His dwelling in Israel. In the Messias' day He would again dwell with His people. "Sing praise, and rejoice, O daughter of Sion: for behold I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord" (Zach. 2:10; Mt. 2:14).[9] Like their Jewish contemporaries, the Apostles must have cherished the hope that the *Shekinah* would soon be restored. Therefore, our Lord's response to Jude, that He and His Father will come and dwell with those who love Him, must have taken the sting from the Apostles' disappointment and given them great comfort. Their Master was promising them the "Dwelling," the *Shekinah! Quaesierat enim de Christi manifestatione, et audivit de dilectione et mansione.* St. Augustine.[10]

If anyone love me, he will keep my word. In verse 15 Jesus declared that obedience is the proof of charity: "If you love

[5] *Tract. LXXVI in Ioannis Evangelium,* MPL 35, 1832.

[6] שכינתא lit. "dwelling."

[7] Ex. 40:36 (TM 40:38); 3 Kgs. 8:10-11.

[8] Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament Aus Talmud und Midrasch,* B. III, p. 182.

[9] This prophecy was fulfilled perfectly in the Incarnation; cf. Jn. 1:14.

[10] MPL 35, 1832.

me, keep my commandments." Now, repeating the statement of verse 21, which provoked Jude's question, he teaches that love proved by obedience, is the indispensable condition for His manifestation. "Behold the reason why He will manifest Himself to His own, not to strangers, whom he calls the world. The reason is that the former love, the latter do not love... For they who love, because they love, are chosen." (*Qui enim diligunt, quia diligunt, eliguntur*).[11]

And my Father will love him. A heart that loves yearns for love. Unrequited affection is the bitterest sorrow; requieted love, the sweetest joy. Later in His discourse (15:14), our Lord expressly tells the Apostles that they are His friends, not His servants. The essence of friendship is mutual love. *Ad rationem amicitiae requiritur quaedam mutua amatio, quia amicus est amico amicus.*[12] Not only does Jesus love those who love Him, the Father returns the love shown to His Son. They who keep the word of Christ are the friends of God.

The effect of love is union. Though thousands of miles separate them, lovers are united in their mutual affection. But love ever seeks real union. God, therefore, comes to His friends. *We will come to him and make our abode with him* (ἐλευσόμεθα ποιησόμεθα). The first person plural subject of these verbs refers explicitly to the Father and the Son, who are mentioned in the preceding phrases. But the Holy Spirit is also included. Jesus does not name the Holy Spirit, because He has spoken of His indwelling in a preceding passage (14:16-17).

Lest anyone imagine that the Father and the Son only, without the Holy Spirit, make their abode with those that love them, let him recall what was said above about the Holy Spirit, "whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you shall know him, because He will dwell with you, and be in you." (Jn. 14:17) Behold, along with the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit also makes His dwelling with the saints; within them, indeed, as God in His temple. The Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit come to us, while we are coming to them. They come with help, we come with obedience; they come to enlighten, we come to behold; they come to fill, we come to receive, that our vision of them may not be exterior, but interior, and that their dwelling in us may not be passing, but eternal.[13]

[11] *ibid.*

[12] S. Th. II^{a}-II^{ae}, Q. XXIII, art, 1, corp. art.

[13] Augustine, *op. cit.*

Or, as St. Thomas suggests,[14] there was no need to include expressly the Holy Spirit; the mention of the Father and the Son implies the presence of the Holy Spirit, since He is their mutual, substantial love.

From the context it is clear that the promised visits and abiding presence of the Triune God with those who love Christ is a divine act of friendship, a response of love to love, a new mode of the divine presence in souls that have supernatural charity. It is an interior presence, an indwelling, since it is not visible to the world. It is a dwelling of God with man, not an absorption of the creature in the deity. The visit and indwelling of God promised by Jesus, is far removed from the mystic union of Pantheists, which, rejecting the distinction between the human and divine, ends in atheism.

> But let all agree uncompromisingly on this, if they would not err from truth and from the orthodox teaching of the Church: to reject every kind of mystic union, by which the faithful would in any way pass beyond the sphere of creatures and rashly enter the divine, even to the extent of one single attribute of the Godhead being predicated of them as their own.... Let it be observed also that one is treating here of a hidden mystery, which in this earthly exile can never be fully disclosed and grasped, and expressed in human language. The Divine Persons are said to be indwelling in as much as they are present to intellectual creatures in a way that lies beyond human comprehension, and are known and loved by them in a purely supernatural manner alone, within the deepest sanctuary of the soul.[15]

We will come to him. "Something is said to come to a place where it was not before: but this can not be said of God, since He is everywhere ... He is said to come to someone in as much as He is there in a new manner, according to which He was not previously there, namely through the effect of grace."[16] God, the creator and conserver, who is everywhere by His Essence, His Presence and His Power, comes in a new manner, as a friend, the object of supernatural knowledge and love, to those who love and obey the Incarnate Son.

And make our abode with him. Μονή (here and in 14:2) is derived from the verb μένειν, which occurs frequently (fourteen times) in this discourse of our Lord. Μένειν means "to remain,"

[14] Thomas Aq., *op. cit.*, cap. XIV, lect. VI, 3.

[15] Pius XII, Encyclical Letter "Mystici Corporis," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXV (1943), pp. 231-232 (Eng. trans. NCWC, pp. 49-50).

[16] Thomas Aq., *op. cit.*, cap. XIV, lect. 6, 3.

ubi sum, ibi maneo nec inde discedo (Zorell).[17] Μονή, therefore, signifies, 1) a tarrying, an abiding, a dwelling; 2) a place of dwelling, an abode. It is used in this latter sense in 14:2. In our passage it keeps its primary meaning. Fr. Zorell[18] points out that the expression μονὴν ποιεῖσθαι occurs in Thucydides, with the meaning *morari, moram trahere.* This phrase of our Blessed Lord, therefore, expresses the permanence of God's visit to His friends. He comes not as a guest for a passing visit, but as a friend to lead a common life with his loved one, to communicate with him in the sanctuary of his soul, drawing him by grace and the cleansing power of His purgations to an ever clearer knowledge of Himself and an ever more intimate union. "But we all, with faces unveiled, reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into his very image from glory to glory, as through the Spirit of the Lord" (2 Cor. 3:18). As long as the soul remains just, in the state of grace, i.e., the friend of God, so long does God dwell in it. By reason of his divine indwelling man becomes the abode of God, and his very body acquires the holiness of a sanctuary. "Do you not know that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you?... for holy is the temple of God, and this temple you are" (1 Cor. 3:16-17; 6:19-20).

The sublimest commentary on our verse was written by the Evangelist, who recorded these words of His Master. Christ promised the divine indwelling to him who loves and proves his love by the observance of His word. The word of Christ that embraces all His precepts, is the law of charity. "This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you" (Jn. 15:12). Collating this precept of charity with the promise of the indwelling, John writes in his First Epistle: "If we love one another, God abides in us and his love is perfected in us.... God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God in him" (1 Jn. 4:12,16). Of the Old Testament law of charity, which demanded as proof of man's love for God, that he love his neighbor as himself, Jesus declared: "On these two commandments depend the whole Law and the Prophets" (Mt. 22:40). Christian charity, which loves as Christ has loved, unites the human soul in a bond of intimate friendship with God: "We will come to him and make our abode with him."

[17] F. Zorell, S.J., *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti* (Paris:1931) col. 816
[18] *op. cit.*, col. 853.

24. *He who does not love me does not keep my words. And the words that you have heard is not mine, but the Father's who sent me.* Father Lagrange[19] very nicely terms this text "the obverse of the medal." Jesus does not manifest Himself to worldlings, because they do not love and obey Him. *Remota enim causa removetur effectus.* Christ manifests Himself to him who loves and obeys. Moreover, the Father loves such a one, and the Triune God comes and dwells with him. The world cannot receive these tokens of the divine friendship, because it is not the friend of God. Worldlings have not charity.

And the word that you have heard is not mine, but the Father's who sent me. All the teaching and instruction of the Incarnate Son, His present discourse as well as His previous teaching, is the word of the Father, who sent the Son in the Incarnation precisely for this purpose,—to speak in His name. "For I have not spoken on my own authority, but he who sent me, the Father, has given me commandment what I should say, and what I should declare" (Jn. 12:49; cf. 7:16; 8:26). Our Blessed Lord does not deny that His teaching is His own. Rather, he affirms that it is not only His. It is common to Himself and the Father. Thus He explains His statement: "If anyone loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him." It could be objected that a more logical apodosis would be: I will love him; I will come to him.[20] But the Father and the Son are one; the Father is in the Son and the Son is in the Father (14:10). Since the principle of the divine actions *ad extra* is the divine nature, all these actions, and revelation is such an act, are common to the three divine Persons. Therefore, the teaching expressed by the human lips of the Incarnate Son, is the word of God, of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. So that whoever loves and obeys Christ, becomes the friend of God, the beloved of the Father, the temple of the Trinity.

II. JESUS' PROMISE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: 25-26

Having answered Jude's question, our Lord resumes His interrupted discourse, summing up in a few lines all that He had said about the graces His Apostles would receive after His departure.

[19] M.—J. Lagrange, O.P., *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Paris: Gabalda, 1926) p. 391.

[20] Cf. Thomas Aq., *op. cit.*, cap. XIV, lect. VI, 5.

25,26. *These things I have spoken to you while yet dwelling with you. But the Advocate* (ὁ παράκλητος), *the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring to your mind whatever I have said to you.* These things (ταῦτα) refers to λόγος and λόγους of verse 24, i.e., to all the doctrine which Jesus has taught His Apostles while living with them. Now He is about to leave them. He is aware that, because of their deep-seated prejudices, they have not grasped the full import of His teaching. Jude's question was a striking example of their slowness to comprehend. To comfort His bewildered little flock, Jesus promises that, after His departure, the Father will send them the Holy Spirit, who will lead them to a clear understanding of all that is now so perplexing. In verse 17 Jesus called the promised Advocate "the Spirit of truth." Now He declares emphatically that the office of the Holy Spirit is that of teacher, Master of Christian Doctrine.

He will teach you all things and bring to your mind all things, (πάντα) *whatever I have said to you. He* (ἐκεῖνος), lit. "that one." To emphasize the subject John frequently employs ἐκεῖνος. Cf. Jn. 1:8,18. *Whatever I have said to you,* ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν ἐγώ, certainly modifies the second πάντα. The Holy Spirit will recall to the Apostles all that their Master had told them. Does this phrase also limit the extension of the first πάντα. This πάντα is certainly opposed to ταῦτα of the preceding verse. Thus Plummer[21] notes on ταῦτα of verse 25: "for emphasis in opposition to πάντα in v. 26. "Thus much I tell you now; the Advocate shall tell you all." But it would be wrong to overemphasize this opposition, as if our Lord had given only a fragmentary doctrine, which was to be completed by the addition of truths entirely new. "The first πάντα of v. 26 is rather in relation with the second, without a comma after the first, so that it is the same group of truths that the Paraclete will teach and will recall."[22] The opposition between ταῦτα and πάντα is not that of a part to a whole, but rather of an obscure teaching (obscure by reason of the prejudices of the Apostles) to a body of doctrine clearly comprehended. In 16: 13 Jesus says expressly that the teaching office of the Holy Spirit will be to guide (ὁδηγήσει) the Apostles into all truth, "that is to

[21] A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Cambridge Greek Testament; Cambridge: 1929), p. 281.

[22] Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 391.

say, he will complete the work begun by Christ, by giving to the disciple to understand and admit the teaching of the Master in all its truth, with all its consequences."[23] The two functions of the Holy Spirit, teaching and recalling, are connected. The office of the Holy Spirit is to recall to the minds of the Apostles all that their Master had taught them, pointing out to them, at the same time, the profound meaning of those truths, their interrelation, their application to the changing circumstances of the Church's life. Thus, in recalling the old He will be teaching them new truths. Thus St. Thomas[24] understands our verse: "From the coming of the Holy Spirit great things will follow, namely the understanding of all the words of Christ. And therefore with reference to this, first He recalls to them His teachings, then He promises them an understanding of those teachings, namely, the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit will teach you all things." St. Cyril of Alexandria[25] expressly links the two phrases: "He will teach you all things whatever I have said to you." In confirmation of this interpretation we may cite our Lord's commission to the Apostles, as recorded in Mt. 28:19-20. They are to make disciples of all nations, teaching them to observe all that Christ has commanded them.

He will teach you and bring to your mind. Is this promise limited to the Apostles personally? Or does it include as, e.g. Mt. 28:19-20, Jn. 20:23, the successors of the Apostles? As first promulgators of the teachings of their Master, the Apostles received a special charism, that was not given to their successors. Between Pentecost and John's death, the Apostles added to the *corpus doctrinae* truths, which, if not entirely new, were such as could not have been drawn from the teaching of Christ without the revelation of the Holy Spirit. The *depositum fidei* was closed and sealed only at the death of the beloved Apostle. Is the promise contained in our verse limited to this special charism of the Apostolic office? Exegetes are not of one mind.[26] The phrase introducing the promise, ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ' ὑμῖν μένων and the expression ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς, he will bring back to your mind,

[23] A. Durand, S.J., *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Verbum Salutis; Paris: Beauchesne, 1930), p. 430.

[24] *Op. cit.*, cap. XIV, lect. VI, 6.

[25] *In Ioannis Evangelium Liber Decimus*, MPG 74, 301.

[26] Cf. Maldonatus, *Comm. in Quatuor Evangelistas, in loc;* cf. also Corluy, *Spicilegium Dogmatico-Biblicum*, Vol. I, pp. 27, 29, 30.

favor the restrictive interpretation. Our verse, however, is certainly parallel to 14:26. There our Lord promises that the Spirit of truth will be with the Apostles εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, indicating that the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit will be accorded to the successors of the Apostles unto the end of time. Thus it would seem that our verse is a promise both of the special charism exclusively proper to the Apostolic office, and of the divine assistance, by means of which the Church's magisterium preserves in its entirety and expounds with ever-growing clarity and fruitfulness the *depositum* left by the Apostles.

The Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name. The text is traditional among theologians as a scriptural source for the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. It expresses in unambiguous language the real distinction between the persons of the Godhead, portraying them with the functions of distinct hypostases,—the Father sending, the Holy Spirit sent in place of the Son. *In my name.* As the Son has been sent into this world by the Father, as His representative and with His authority (Jn. 5:43; 10:25), to accomplish the plan of redemption promised in the Old Testament, so the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son (16:7), as the representative of the Son, to continue and bring to completion the mission of His Incarnate life. As the Son coming in the name of the Father, makes His faithful subject to the Father: Apoc. 5:10, "Thou hast made us a kingdom for our God" etc., so the Holy Spirit has made us like to the Son, in as much as He makes us adopted sons of God: Rom. 8:15, "You have received a spirit of adoption as sons, by virtue of which we cry, Abba, Father!"[27] As Christ is the prophet of the Father, speaking His words (24), so the Holy Spirit, by His mysterious action in the souls of the Apostles and their successors, is the teacher and interpreter of Christ's doctrine.

Ὁ παράκλητος. In the New Testament this word occurs only in the writings of St. John; four times in the Gospel (14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7), where our Lord employs it to designate the office of the Holy Spirit, and once in John's First Epistle (1 Jn. 2:1), where it is applied to Christ. In the Gospel passages ancient interpreters usually take it to mean "Comforter." "The Holy Spirit is called παράκλητος because He comforts and consoles and helps our infirmities" (St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. XVI, 20).[28]

[27] Thomas Aq., *op. cit.*, cap. XIV, lect. VI, 6. [28] MPG 33, 947.

With this interpretation most of the Greek Fathers agree.[29] The same interpretation prevailed in the West. St. Thomas'[30] statement: *hoc nomen Paraclitus est graecum, et significat consolatorem* expresses the accepted Western interpretation. In the passage of John's First Epistle, however, Paraclete has always been understood in the sense of Advocate,—Defender or Intercessor. The Vulgate translation of 1 Jn. 2:1, *Sed et si quis peccaverit, Advocatum habemus apud Patrem, Jesum Christum iustum,* is a witness to the prevailing interpretation of Paraclete in this passage. Modern exegetes understand the term in the sense of Advocate or Defender in the Gospel passages, as well as in the Epistle.

Παράκλητος is derived from the verb παρακαλεῖν and in form is a verbal adjective. The primary meaning of παρακαλεῖν is *advocare,* to call to the side of. Verbal adjectives in τος formed from transitive verbs are usually passive in meaning. Etymology and grammar would thus seem to be decisive for the translation *Advocatus,* one summoned to another's side. But the question is not settled so simply. In the *Koine* language παρακαλεῖν frequently means to comfort, to console. Cf. Gen. 37:35; 2 Cor. 1:4; 2:7; 7:6; 1 Thess. 3:2; 4:18; Mt. 2:18; 5:4 etc. Moreover, since the verbal adjective in τος has never really entered the verb system, it is *per se* free of voice connexion.[31] Consequently, the premise meaning of these verbals cannot be determined by grammar. In every case usage alone must decide whether the meaning of an active or a passive form is to be assigned to these verbals.[32] In the case of παράκλητος usage is decisive for the interpretation Advocate. Although rare in classical Greek,[33] wherever the word occurs it is equivalent in meaning as well as etymology to the Latin juridical term, *advocatus,* one summoned to the side of another to aid him in a court of justice, our "counsel for the defense." A similar signification is given to the word by Philo, who employs it several times. The earliest Chris-

[29] Cf. J. Hastings, "Paraclete," *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible,* Vol. III, pp. 666-667; also Lagrange, *op. cit.,* pp. 381, 383.

[30] *Op. cit.,* cap. XIV, lect. IV, 2.

[31] J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek,* Vol. I, *Prolegomena* (3d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930), p. 221.

[32] Moulton, *op. cit.,* p. 222.

[33] All the pertinent texts from the classics, Philo, etc., are discussed in Hastings, *op. cit.,* p. 666; cf. also Lagrange.

tian writers use the word in the same sense. Thus the Epistle of Barnabas XX,2[34] calls the wicked, who follow the way of the Black One, *πλουσίων παράκλητοι, πενήτων ἄνομοι κριταί*, "advocates of the rich, unjust judges of the poor."

The Greek word, in its usual meaning of advocate or intercessor, was taken over in rabbinical literature in the form פְּרַקְלִיטָא פְּרַקְלִיט. It occurs, for example, in the Targum on Job 33:23, where it is the antithesis of קַטֵּיגוֹר gr. *κατήγωρ*, "accuser." "If a man has merits, an angel is appointed as advocate among a thousand accusers, in order to declare his righteousness to men."[35] It is probable, therefore, that *παράκλητος* in the Gospel passages is the very word employed by our Lord in its Aramaic form to designate the office of the Holy Spirit.

It is unlikely that St. John would have employed the word in different senses in the Gospel and Epistle, especially since his designation of Christ as Paraclete in the Epistle, was undoubtedly inspired by our Lord's statement: "I will ask the Father and he will give you another Advocate (*ἄλλον παράκλητον*) to dwell with you forever" (14:16). Advocate is the only probable meaning of the word in the Epistle passage. "We have a Comforter with the Father," would be intolerable.

The context undoubtedly led the Fathers to understand the word in the sense of Comforter in the Gospel texts. Throughout the discourse in the Supper Room, our Lord was referring to His departure. The Apostles were filled with sadness and foreboding. Our Lord's promise of the Holy Spirit was intended to comfort and console them for the loss of His visible presence. This is true. But even from the viewpoint of context, Advocate is a better rendering. In every Gospel text in which the word occurs the idea of aiding, defending, instructing is prominent. In 14:17 the Paraclete is the Spirit of truth opposed to the Spirit of deceit. "It is in this way that he assists the Apostles."[36] In our verse the Holy Spirit comes to the Apostles' aid by teaching and reminding them of their Master's doctrine. After telling the Apostles that the world will hate and persecute them, as it has hated and persecuted Him, Jesus promises that the Holy

[34] *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. K. Lake (Loeb Classical Library, New York: Macmillan, 1914), Vol. I, p. 406.

[35] Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, B. II, pp. 560-562.

[36] Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

Spirit will be their defender, because "he will bear witness concerning me" (15:16-17). In 16:7-11 the Holy Spirit defends the Apostles by convicting their adversary, the world.

The translation "Advocate" is in accord with the complete context of all these passages. It brings the language of the Gospel into proper relation to that of the First Epistle of John, which was probably written to introduce the Gospel to its first readers. It contains all that is expressed by "Comforter," while maintaining the precise signification assigned to the Greek word by usage and consonant with its etymology and grammatical form.

Our Blessed Lord, who is about to leave His loved ones to redeem them by His death and to ascend to Heaven to be their Advocate with the Father (1 Jn. 2:1; Heb. 7:26), comforts them for the loss of His visible presence by the promise of another Advocate, the Holy Spirit, who "helps our weakness" (Rom. 8:26).

III. JESUS' FAREWELL: 27-31

27. *Peace I leave with you, my peace I give to you; not as the world gives do I give to you. Do not let your heart be troubled, or be afraid.* "Peace be to you" was the traditional Jewish leave-taking. So our Blessed Lord, who is about to leave the Apostles for His passion and death, wishes them peace. But on His sacred lips these words are not an empty formula of conventional courtesy. Jesus leaves peace in their hearts. He gives them *His* peace,—that interior tranquillity, which never abandoned Him, not even on the cross, when the taunts of His enemies and the pains of a tortured body wrung from His lips the cry of dereliction. Peace is the tranquillity of order, the calm and equanimity that are the quality of right order. Only Christ, the Redeemer, who restores right order in the relation of man to God, can give interior peace of heart, the spiritual serenity that comes from the consciousness of being the friend of God.

Not as the world gives (peace, εἰρήνην, must be supplied) *do I give to you.* The world can give at best an external peace. Statesmen by clever diplomacy can compose conflicts among nations. Law enforcement bodies can guarantee to the individual citizen the quiet possession of his temporal goods. Such peace is merely external. It does not calm the troubled heart, nor ease the tortured soul. The peace, which Jesus gives, can not be disturbed

by exterior conflict. It abides, diffusing courage and joy to the soul, even in the midst of pain, persecution and wars.

Do not let your heart be troubled, or be afraid. Δελιάτω is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament. It occurs in the LXX, Dt. 1:21; 2 Mach. 15:8, where it refers to the fear induced by war. Jesus knows the perils and conflicts the Apostles must face after His departure. Even now, the announcement of that departure has filled them with sadness. Therefore He imparts to them His peace, the peace of a soul that serenely faces a cruel death in obedience to the Father, in order to fortify them for their conflict, to comfort them in their trouble.

28. *You have heard me say to you, "I go away and I am coming to you." If you loved me, you would indeed rejoice that I am going to the Father, for the Father is greater than I.* Jesus' many references to His departure have filled the Apostles with a sorrow that not even the promise of His return has been able to moderate. *If you loved me, you would indeed rejoice* (you would have rejoiced, ἐχάρητε ἂν), *that I am going to the Father.* The presence of ἄν in the apodosis would imply that the protasis is not true, that the condition is not fulfilled. But Jesus does not mean that His Apostles do not love Him. His words must be understood according to the situation which prompted them. He employs the language of a loving father, comforting his weeping children, when setting out on a journey that will bring him great profit.[37] Jesus is going to His Father, to be glorified by Him (12:27-28). Earlier in His discourse, He comforted the Apostles by pointing out the advantages they would receive from His departure. He was going to prepare a place for them (14:3). He would send them the Holy Spirit (14:16,25-26). Now He endeavors to console them by an appeal to their love. Their very sadness proceeded from the love they bore Him. They understood that He was going to suffering and death; they did not yet understand the glory He would acquire through those sufferings. If they had known that He was going to the Father, to sit at His right hand in the Heavenly Kingdom, their joy over His exaltation would have far surpassed their sorrow over their own loss and their grief over His sufferings.[38]

For the Father is greater than I. Behold the reason why the

[37] Cf. Maldonatus, *op. cit. in loc.*
[38] *Id., in loc.*

Apostles should rejoice! The Father is greater than Christ. Therefore, His going to the Father will be gain.

The Arians made capital of these words in support of their heresy that the Son is not true God of true God, consubstantial and coequal with the Father. Such an interpretation stands condemned by the whole tenor of the Fourth Gospel, by the purpose that prompted John to write (Jn. 20:31). In this very discourse Jesus declares emphatically His oneness with the Father (14: 8-11).

Some of the Fathers, e.g., St. Athanasius, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Hilary,[39] did think that Christ was referring in this verse to His divine Sonship. The Son has received His divine nature from the Father by an eternal generation. The Father, therefore, can be called greater than the Son in as much as He is the *principium sine principio* from whom the Son has His nature. But the Son must be called equal, not less than the Father, because He has received all that the Father has. "In his commentary Cyril has given a decisive argument against this exegesis. It would not be precisely a subject of joy for the disciples in the present circumstance to be informed—if they could penetrate the veiled sense of these words—on this particular aspect of the Trinity."[40] Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Augustine,[41] etc. have shown that Jesus is here speaking with reference to His humanity. St. Thomas[42] points out that the key to the interpretation of the phrase, *Pater major me est,* is the preceding expression, *Vado ad Patrem.* From all eternity the Son is with the Father in the unity of the divine nature (Jn. 1:1). Therefore, the Son can be said to go to the Father only *secundum suam humanam naturam.* Consequently, in this verse Jesus is speaking of the destiny of His humanity. As man the Son is inferior to the Father; inferior to the angels (Heb. 2:9); inferior, as a subject is less than his superiors, to Mary and Joseph, since He was subject to them (Lk. 2:51). With his usual penetration Father Lagrange[43] notes how this verse supposes the divinity of Jesus, since it would be absurd to institute a comparison between

[39] MPG 26, 131-134; 111-114; MPL 10, 325.

[40] Lagrange, *op. cit.,* p. 395; cf. Cyrillus Alex., *In Ioannis Ev. Liber Decimus,* MPG 74, 307-326.

[41] MPG 59, 408; MPL 35, 1835-1836.

[42] *Op. cit.,* cap. XIV, lect. 8, 1.

[43] Lagrange, *op. cit.,* p. 395.

God and a mere man, only to draw the too evident conclusion that the man is inferior. The celebrated passage of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, 2:6-11, may serve as a commentary on our verse. Paul expresses all that is merely hinted at in the words of Jesus: the divinity of Christ, His condescension in the Incarnation, His exaltation in the glory of the Father.

29. *And now I have told you before it comes to pass, that when it has come to pass you may believe.* To what does this prediction refer? Lagrange[44] would limit it to Jesus' departure, to His passion and death, as in 13:19. By foretelling this sad event Jesus guards the Apostles against scandal; He turns "a stumblingblock into an aid to faith." St. Augustine[45] includes the Resurrection and Ascension. *"Illud utique dicit, cum factum fuerit, quod eum visuri erunt post mortem viventem, et ad Patrem ascendentem.* The immediate context favors Augustine's interpretation. The preceding verse contains, besides an allusion to our Lord's death (I go away), also a veiled reference to His Resurrection (I am coming to you) and Ascension (I am going to the Father). Maldonatus[46] notes that some would include the mission of the Holy Spirit promised in verse 26. Certainly, in the fulfillment of all these predictions, the Apostles found a new motive for their faith in Christ.

30,31a. *I will no longer speak much with you, for the prince of the world is coming, and in me he has nothing. But he comes that the world may know that I love the Father, and that I do as the Father commanded me.* Jesus is aware that the Apostles are still perplexed. But there is no time for a fuller development of His thought. The hour of His departure, the hour of the power of darkness (Lk. 22:53), is at hand. Satan, the prince of the world, which is full of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life (1 Jn. 2:15), comes in his minions to unleash against Christ all the fury of hell. The horrible tragedy is already under way. Judas, into whose heart Satan has entered (Lk. 22:3), has gone out into the night to accomplish his black design (Jn. 13:30). Jesus goes freely to His passion and death, because such is the Father's will. The result (*ἵνα consecutive*[47])

[44] *Id.*

[45] MPL 35, 1837.

[46] Maldonatus, *op. cit., in loc.*

[47] Cf. Moulton, *op. cit.*, (*ἵνα ἐκβατικόν*), pp. 206-208, 211.

of Satan's assault will be that the World will know the Incarnate Son's devotion to His Father. Through His obedience unto the death of the Cross, Christ wrests from Satan his empire over souls and wins His own exaltation at the right hand of the Father.

May the world learn from the example of Christ, its Savior! Only when all men love God unto the self-immolation that obedience to His words demands, will the Peace of Christ still forever the clash of arms.

St. Michael's Monastery
Union City, N. J.

"EL GIBBOR"

Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

Looking forward from the early reign of Achaz into the immediate future, Isaias sees Zabulon and Nephthali soon to be conquered and partly depopulated by Assyria. The plight of their people will be desperate, maddening, without a ray of hope to relieve its "gloom of anguish." But a remoter future will more than compensate for all. Galilee will one day be the very cradle of a reign of peace so glorious that the land "formerly slighted" will be "at the last loaded with honor." As the glowing vision unfolds upon his soul, the prophet proclaims it in words (9:6-7) which none can read, however often, without feeling their power anew. So vivid is the scene to his mind's eye that he describes the future as a present fact:

> For a child is born to us, a son is given us,
> and the sovereignty is upon his shoulder.
> And they name him Wondrous Counsellor, *'El Gibbor,*
> Father for ever, Prince of peace.

Of the four attributive titles which compose the Child's symbolic name, we have left in the original one which seems incommensurate with all the rest. It evidently staggered the Jewish translators of the Septuagint. They paraphrased the beginning of the last distich in such inexplicable fashion that St. Jerome wrote, "I believe that the Seventy, alarmed at the majesty of the names, durst not say of the Child that he would be plainly called God, and so on, but substituted for these six names something not present in the Hebrew."[1] ("Six names," because his own interpretation resolves the first two into four: *Admirabilis, Consiliarius, Deus, Fortis.*) Certainly, *'el gibbor* must have seemed to them an inconceivable thing for one of their own prophets to have predicated of a newborn child. The other attributes, lofty as they were, did not surpass the unique dignity of the Anointed; but "the Seventy" would not be answerable for translating *'el gibbor* in the only meaning obvious to them.

Modern Jewish translators have had recourse to other methods not less significant. Their version of *The Holy Scripture according to the Masoretic Text*[2] retains the Hebrew of the name in transcript, translating it marginally, "Wonderful in counsel is

[1] *In Isaiam Prophetam,* MPL 24, 130.

[2] Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1917, p. 489.

God the Mighty, the Everlasting Father, the Ruler of peace." Of the merits of this interpretation suffice it to say that it ruins all connection between the sense of the passage and its metrical structure, besides making the attributive name one fourth predicate and three fourths subject. But it demonstrates that the authors (who should know Hebrew) could see no other meaning in the phrase *'el gibbor* than the one so long familiar to us all.

Any serious discussion of its meaning must be both objective and thorough. Yet to begin with a methodical account of its whole textual and exegetical history would exceed the limits of our space. It would also be practically needless. Textually, the Hebrew sources do not vary in this phrase, though the versions differ much. For exegesis a brief summary suffices. Christian interpreters until about the early nineteenth century have rendered the phrase "mighty God." Catholics have continued to do so ever since, including the recent authors Condamin, Feldmann, and Fischer. So also does Gray, in the *International Critical Commentary.* On the contrary, many liberals of the modern period (e.g. Gesenius, De Wette, Dillmann, Gunkel, Duhm, Marti, Briggs, Kennett) have rendered *'el gibbor* by the synonymous phrases *ein Gott von einem Helden, Gottheld,* "a god of a hero, godlike hero." This rendering is now upheld by a single Catholic commentator, Dr. Edward J. Kissane, in his recently published "Book of Isaiah."[3]

This circumstance revives the issue, and at the same time simplifies it. So far as this study is concerned, the alternatives are definite: does *'el gibbor* mean "mighty God," or "divine hero"? After quoting Dr. Kissane's opinion fully, we shall try to obtain an impartial verdict from the witness of literary usage.

Dr. Kissane's view appears in his text and commentary as compared. He renders Isa. 9:6 (Heb. 9:5) as follows:

> For a child is born to us,
> A son is given to us,
> And authority is upon his shoulder;
> And his name is called:
> Wonder-counsellor, Divine-hero,
> Father for ever, Prince of peace.[4]

Commenting on the first pair of attributes, Dr. Kissane writes:

Wonder-counsellor, lit. "wonder of a counsellor." ... The wisdom which is necessary for a ruler will be his in an extraordinary degree.

[3] Vol. I, Chapters I-XXXIX; Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1941.

[4] *Op. cit.,* p. 107.

Divine-hero, lit. "god of a warrior." The parallelism with the other titles proves that this, and not "hero-god," is the correct rendering. It does not mean that the person is divine; for the term is used by Ezechiel of the dead heroes of ancient times now in Sheol (Ezech. xxxii,21). It means simply that the power necessary to rule will be possessed by the Messiah in an extraordinary measure.[5]

We postpone for the moment the discussion of *'el gibbor* in Isa. 10:21. Neither is this the place to comment on the arguments adduced in the present connection, which will be directly noticed below. But what deserves remark just here is the confusion occasioned by Dr. Kissane's choice of words. "Mighty God" and "godlike hero" remain the actual terms of contrast as determined by syntax. To express the former as "hero-god" is to misrepresent the traditional exegesis by confining the divine attribute of "might" to the one idea conspicuously absent from the context—that of military prowess. Again, "divine-hero" is explained as rendering "god of a warrior," which simply amounts to "godlike warrior." This might be expressed by "divine hero," in a popular and improper sense of "divine"; but the insertion of a hyphen makes the phrase totally unintelligible.

However, we wish to avoid misunderstanding. Dr. Briggs may be fairly taken as spokesman for the liberal view, since he is the author of the article on *'el* in the Brown-Driver-Briggs recension of Gesenius' *Thesaurus.*[6] For reasons which will appear later, he offers two alternative meanings for *'el gibbor.* Both take the two words as substantives, of which the first is in the construct state. Thus, (1) "*mighty hero* (as above)" refers to his prior assertion that *'el* is "applied to men of might and rank" as one of its "subordinate applications." This would literally result in something like "a prince of a hero." (2) Briggs' alternative is "*divine hero* (as reflecting the divine majesty)," apparently meaning one whose prowess as a victorious leader "reflects" the irresistible sovereignty of God. This latter is the equivalent of Dr. Kissane's explanation, "literally 'god of a warrior.' "

In either of these cases the second word (taken as substantive) is in the "genitive of genus," a fairly common feature of Hebrew syntax.[7] It is present in the preceding phrase of this very verse, "prodigy of a counsellor." Thus a choice is offered between

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 112.

[6] *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Boston: 1907), p. 42.

[7] Cowley, §128*l;* Joüon, §129*f,* 3.

"prince of a warrior" (taking *'el* as "mighty one" or "leader") and "god of a warrior." The first translation can be justified only by establishing that *'el* sometimes means "mighty one" or "leader." The second—the preference of both Briggs and Kissane—reduces *'el* or "god" to a mere metaphor in the mind of any Hebrew writer. On the other hand, the traditional exegesis understands the substantive "God" followed (in the regular Hebrew order of words) by the attributive adjective "mighty." Which of these translations expresses the mind of the men who used the language and created the literature of the Old Testament, must be determined by the witness of their usage.

The Philological Setting

Lexicographers naturally differ in method and approach to our main question: the actual meaning of *'el.* As between Gesenius[8] and his later revisers, Buhl[9] and Brown-Driver-Briggs,[10] the last named are the most given to multiple distinctions in etymology. Eduard König[11] allows a fairer measure of influence to the peculiar direction which the *gemeinsemitisch* acquires in Hebrew; but the statements of his lexicon are terse and his references few. Zorell's new work,[12] though not yet complete, is now available in the present question. For verbal statistics Mandelkern[13] remains the standard source.

1. *'El* in the singular occurs about 230 times, of which 23 are in Isaias. The plural *'elim* is much less frequent, as meaning something that is quoted without approval. The derivation of the word is uncertain, but about its various meanings there is a large measure of agreement.

a) The normal signification, present in about 200 cases, is "God," naturally excluded from the rarer plural. "A god" (or "gods") may be termed (with Zorell) a "less proper" meaning

[8] *Thesaurus linguae hebraeae et chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti*[2] (Leipzig: 1829).

[9] *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch* (17 aufl., Leipzig: 1921).

[10] *Op. supra cit.*, (n. 6).

[11] *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig: 1931).

[12] *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti*, Fasc. 1, (Rome: 1940).

[13] *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae hebraicae atque chaldaicae*[2] (Berlin: 1940).

by comparison, but by no means a mere figure, since what is expressed is still *a divine being,* alleged if not real. Generally speaking, the word is the poetical counterpart of *'eloah* and its plural *'elohim.* The construct state often governs an attribute, as in "God of eternity," "of fidelity," "of truth," and the like. The absolute may be followed by attributive adjectives such as "high," "almighty," "great."

b) Whether the phrase *b^{e}ney 'elim* shows the plural to occur in a still "less proper" meaning is open to dispute. Buhl, Briggs and Zorell (who cites Joüon) think it equivalent to "angels" (as *pertinentes ad ordinem divorum*) in Ps. 29:1 and 89:1. In both passages, however, *'elim* encounters a textual difficulty to be noticed more fully below, where the variant reading makes it "sons of mighty ones" or "princes." Seeing that *'elim* itself, when textually clear, quite predominates in the meaning "(false) gods"—sometimes designating the images directly—it is hard to see how "sons of gods" could denote an order of sacred and beneficent superhuman beings, otherwise known as "messengers of Yahweh." Gesenius calls the interpretation *valde dubia,* and König does not notice it.

c) At this point we may note the exclusion of the peculiar phrase "belonging to the *'el* of one's hand," that is, within one's power or opportunity. It occurs five times, namely, in Gen. 31: 29; Deut. 28:32; 2 Esdr. 5:5; Prov. 3:27; Mich. 2:1 (to which Zorell adds two cases in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus). All authorities recognize here a different *'el,* meaning "power" in the abstract, and not to our present purpose.

d) The singular *'el* as also *'elohim* in "plural of majesty") appears in a very few places as an attributive genitive which at first sight suggests poetic hyperbole. An object of uncommon grandeur is said to be "of God" in its class or kind. Authors differ about the number of examples, but all agree in three cases of *'el,* namely, "mountains of God" (Ps. 35:7), "cedars of God" (Ps. 79:11), and "stars of God" (Isa. 14:13), the last explained as meaning the highest stars. Gesenius thinks that, fundamentally, the eminence of the object made it seem specially worthy of God's authorship. This would make the genitive virtually possessive in the underlying thought, though developed into an attributive. In any case, it could hardly have begun as "godlike."

e) Finally, *'el* is by some alleged to have the meaning "leader, chief, potentate" among men. Buhl does not subscribe to this, and Zorell allows but one instance of *'elim,* and only as "conjectural." Some such value seems to attach to *'elohim* (the natural plural) in the few places where it denotes the "judges" or chief officials of the earlier theocracy. But when the meaning "mighty one" or "chief" is ascribed to *'el* by Gesenius, Briggs and König, all of them signally fail to support the assertion. They cite indeed Isa. 9:5 and 10:21, but these are the very places where their claim must be made good. Every other passage cited by any of them is one of uncertain text. The variant is another substantive, *'ayil,* meaning sometimes "ram" and sometimes (probably in consequence) "leader." This, of course, reads *'eyl* in the construct singular, and has the same stem in both states of the plural (*'eylim, 'eyley*). The idea "leader" or "potentate" is satisfied by his reading, but must be verified for *'el,* at least by one incontestable example.

The affirmative claim is advanced on different grounds. König[14] derives the meaning "god" by way of synecdoche from the radical idea "mighty one," supposed to derive from *'ālāh,* "strengthen." His only example is Ezech. 32:21, one of the doubtful texts. Gesenius[15] would refer *'el* (participially) to *'îl* or *'ûl,* a root unknown in Hebrew and conjectured to mean "be strong." He instances *'el* as *heros* in Ezech. 31:11, and *'elim* (*'eley*) in a similar meaning in Job 41:17 and Ezech. 32:21, while acknowledging the variant reading. Briggs,[16] leaving etymology undecided, affirms *'el* to mean "*god,* but with various subordinate applications to express the idea of might." Starting thus, he declares *'el* to mean "mighty one" in Ezech. 31:11, and *'elim* (or *'eley*) to express the plural of the same in Ex. 15:15; 4 Kgs. 24:15; Job 41:17; Ezech. 17:13 and 32:21. All of these are disputed readings. To discredit the variant (which would make perfect sense) he remarks that "these readings are uncertain because of an effort to distinguish these forms from the divine name." If this be true, it is strange that Ginsburg, in the pertinent passage of his *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible,*[17] does not even mention the separately written *'el* (i.e. outside theophoric names) as an instance of this scribal device, even

[14] *Op. cit.,* p. 17.
[15] *Op. cit.,* p. 48.
[16] *Op. cit.,* p. 42.
[17] (London: 1897), pp. 396 ff.

with such conspicuous examples before him. While the texts remain uncertain for any reason, nothing can be established by them. Yet Gesenius, Briggs and König not only found upon these passages their alleged meaning of *'el,* but proceed immediately to claim it in the undisputed passages in Isaias, as if logically in the same class. Buhl and Zorell justly ignore it.

Briggs takes a further step. As if to satisfy either reading in the disputed passages, he offers, as observed above, the alternative translations "mighty hero" and "divine hero," preferring the latter, as does Dr. Kissane. The two, however, are not co-extensive. "Prince of a hero" (reading *'eyl*) would be correctly translated, but would have no original in Isaias, where the alternate reading is not found. "God of a hero" (reading *'el*) supposes the only reading that is clear in Isaias, but gives it a rendering that is more than suspicious. We have seen that *'el* normally designates *divinity, true or alleged,* however it acquired the meaning. In this regular value the word pervades two thirds of the Old Testament books, both pre- and post-exilic. Once this meaning is grasped and kept in mind, only demonstration could suffice to prove that a Hebrew writer could use the word as a mere metaphor, permitting himself to speak of "a god of a hero" or "warrior." Conjectures on etymology cannot be decisive against the fact of this mass of constant usage, without the support of at least one clear example.

2. *Gibbor* can be discussed more briefly. The word occurs 168 times (including a few parallels common to Kings and Paralipomena), singular and plural being about equally frequent. Nine cases belong to Isaias. The root *gbr* as a verb expresses "be strong" or "prevail," the latter either absolutely or expressly "over" an opponent or obstacle. One derivative, *geber,* means "man" as "virile sex." Hebrew is rich in roots and derivatives expressing strength, power, force as active qualities; *gibbor* seems to be about the most generic of all. Primarily an adjective, it often becomes a concrete substantive, and the two functions may be hard to distinguish, even with the order of the words to assist. "Mighty" or "powerful (one)" generally expresses it.

a) That this applies to fitness for war—wherever the word is not otherwise qualified expressly or by context—is clear to any attentive study. In more than ninety per cent of its occurrences *gibbor* is either "warlike" or "a warrior." However, "hero," as we commonly use it, may say too much. When the fighting man

is distinguished in bravery or prowess, he is usually called *gibbor ḥayil,* "warrior of force" or "power." The experienced soldier or veteran is usually denoted by *'ish milḥamah, "man of* war" by profession. Either phrase may be further qualified by "picked, chosen." Incidentally, we never meet with *gibbor milḥamah,* which would seem to sin by redundancy.

b) However, the warlike application can be dispensed with. A few cases exist in which strength or power in other spheres is expressed, without any suggestion that a military word has been borrowed for use not strictly proper. Nimrod was "mighty in hunting" (*gibbor-ṣayid,* Gen. 10:9). Four overseers or group-commanders of the porters of Solomon's temple are called "the four *gibborey* of the porters" in 1 Par. 9:26, although in military connections *gibbor* alone is never a commander as such. Isaias (5:22) denounces those who are "valiant (*gibborim*) to drink wine"; and those who regard this as a metaphor would hardly reduce it to "soldiers at drinking." In addition to these expressly qualified cases, there are others where abstraction from the military connection is left to the context. Both Boaz (Ruth 2:1) and Kish, the father of Saul (1 Kgs. 9:1), are called *gibbor ḥayil* in an evidently social sense—a powerful, prominent or influential man in the community. In 4 Kgs. 15:20 a tribute is exacted of "all the mighty men of wealth" or "means" (*gibborey haḥayil*). This last instance is not quite evident, since the veteran soldiers might have been mulcted because of their former profits from spoliation; but no such uncertainty attaches to the other cases. They prove that *gibbor* could express might or power other than warlike.

c) This same capacity is still more evident in a few cases where the word is applied to God. Noteworthy is the formula by which God is addressed in Deut. 10:17 and 2 Esdr. 9:32: "God, the great, the mighty (*haggibbor*), and the terrible." Jeremias refers to Him (32:18) as "God the great, the mighty (*haggibbor*)." None of these passages can fairly be said to express an "attribute of God especially as fighting for His people," in spite of Briggs' bold assertion;[18] the contexts of all three are wholly free from any suggestion of warfare and its properties. More remarkable on another score is the fact that, although not one of these passages is written in poetic metre, the word for "God"

[18] *Op. cit.,* p. 150.

is *'el* in the common formula. This points to the union of *gibbor* with *'el* in a conventional phrase which had no warlike implications.

Summing up the account of the two words as we find them used, both separately and in conjunction, by the writers of the Hebrew Scriptures, it must be said that the rendering "mighty God," so long accepted by both Jewish and Christian exegesis, is the only one in keeping with the idiom of the Old Testament.

THE REASONS FOR "DIVINE-HERO" IN THIS PASSAGE

Dr. Kissane endeavors to confirm his interpretation by two reasons.

1. "The parallelism with the other titles proves that this, and not 'hero-god,' is the correct rendering." (In passing, we repeat that "mighty God" is not "hero-god.") While the force of the argument from parallelism is not made clear, it seems to lie in the inference that all four titles must have the same internal construction. Assuredly "wonder of a counsellor," "father of all-time" (Heb.) and "prince of peace" all involve a noun in the construct governing another in the genitive. The conclusion appears to be that *'el gibbor* must likewise be construed as "god of a warrior."

If this is the argument, one may see how far it avails by comparing Isa. 1:26 (in Dr. Kissane's own rendering) :[19]

> And I will restore thy judges as aforetime,
> And thy counsellors as in the beginning;
> Thereafter thou shalt be called:
> City of righteousness, faithful city.

Jerusalem's new name comprises two titles. In Hebrew the first is a noun in the construct followed by a genitive. The second consists of a noun in the absolute followed by an attributive adjective. Parallelism should not be urged too far.

2. "It does not mean that the person is divine; for the term is used by Ezechiel of the dead heroes of ancient times now in Sheol (Ezech. xxxii. 21)." Were it true, 'twere pity that many "divine-heroes" should be already in Sheol before the Light of Galilee should be named "divine-hero" precisely, as Dr. Kissane thinks, in order to express the extraordinary measure of his power to rule. A pity, too, that Ezechiel the priest should deem

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

the departed heroes worthy of a title already conferred by Isaias on the Messiah himself. But no one knows whether it is true, or whether we should read instead *'eyley gibborim,* "the leaders of warriors," as destined to speak from Sheol. This would be more intelligible; but the textual doubt remains unsolved.

Dr. Kissane's confirmatory reasons are not even clearly matters of fact.

The Parallel Passage, Isaias 10:21

The unmodified *'el gibbor* (with attribution not expressed by the article, as in Deut. 10:17; 2 Esd. 9:32; Jer. 32:18) occurs but once again in the Old Testament. It is therefore natural to turn to Isa. 10:21 for any light that it may shed upon 9:6 in its use of the phrase. Again let us quote the text and comment of Dr. Kissane:

> 20 And it shall come to pass in that day,
> No more shall the remnant of Israel
> And the survivors of the house of Jacob
> Lean upon him that smote them,
> But they shall lean upon Jahweh,
> The Holy One of Israel in truth;
> 21 A remnant shall return, a remnant of Jacob,
> To the divine-hero.[20]

We add the pertinent portion of the same author's commentary:

> To the *divine-hero.* In ix 6 this is one of the titles of the Messiah, and the sense is not likely to be different here. The Messiah will be king of the new Sion, and only a remnant will be privileged to be his subjects.[21]

Saint Paul (Rom. 9:27-28) seems to find messianic purport in the next verse (22), whether in its typical sense or in the "consequent" value of its teaching. But this does not determine the immediate historical reference of verse 21, so as to indicate "that day" in 20. The name *sh^{e}'ar yashub,* repeated in 21, was an admonition addressed to the times of Achaz and Ezechias. Verse 20 seems to allude to Achaz' faithless abjuration of the sovereignty of the house of David—a compact which was to begin by making Ezechias a rebellious vassal of Sennacherib, and end by leaving Emmauel himself a king "not of this world" (7:15-16). The whole section 10:5-34 points to "that day" as the day of deliverance from Sennacherib, and culminates in the sudden

[20] Kissane, *op. cit.,* p. 135.
[21] *Id. ibid.,* p. 140.

felling of his "Lebanon" before the surviving "stump of Jesse" can be totally destroyed by him. Verse 20 contrasts the Assyrian "that smote them" with One upon whom the converted remnant will "lean in truth" when Juda's devastation through two successive reigns shall have sifted it out. His identity is not left uncertain. If it is "Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel," who here receives the title of "the divine-hero," the isolation of this attribute in Old Testament literature is only matched by the bathos to which it reduces a magnificent passage.

The true order of fruitful inquiry—from known to unknown—is reversed by deciding that *'el gibbor* means "divine-hero" in 9:6, and thence inferring that "the sense is not likely to be different" when the words are expressly applied to Yahweh by name. The fact is that their clarity here confirms their agelong interpretation there. In Fischer's words: "Der 'starke Gott' ist Jahve, während 9, 5 der Messias 'starker Gott' zubenannt und damit seine Verbundenheit mit dem Gottwesen ausgesprochen wird."[22]

THE INFLUENCE OF THE "HERO" MOTIF

A last word on the implications of the context would normally be in order. The very feature most in need of emphasis happens to be brought to attention by Dr. Kissane's distortion of the conventional phrase "mighty God" into "hero-god" in his commentary. He thinks of divine deliverance in terms of armed conquest, and this because of the presence of the single word *gibbor*—for, as we shall see, nothing else suggests it.

It has been shown above that *gibbor* has this implication almost always, but not quite so; that there are a few passages in which its radical meaning "strong" expresses power in other than warlike spheres of action; and that this is true whether God or man is the subject of attribution. It was also pointed out that the formula "God, the great, the mighty" employs *'el* (not *'elohim*) with *gibbor* (though each has the definite article) in Deut. 10:17; 2 Esd. 9:32 and Jer. 32:18. We invite the reader's own observation of the striking absence from all of these passages of any suggestion that *haggibbor* is "God especially as fighting for His people" (thus Briggs). No warlike situation affects them even remotely.

[22] *Das Buch Isaias, I Teil* (Bonn: 1937), p. 98.

What, then, is the case in Isaias 9:2-7? The Hebrew might be rendered as follows:

2 The people who walked in darkness
have seen a great light;
The dwellers in a land of deathlike gloom,
upon them has radiance shone.
3 Thou hast multiplied the nation for them,
Thou hast made joy abundant;
They rejoice before Thee with harvesters' joy,
or as men exult when dividing booty.
4 For the yoke of their burden, the rod for their back,
the scepter of him who oppressed them,
Thou hast broken, as in the day of Madian.
5 For all the violent, riotous plunder,
and every garment rolled in blood
has come to burning and fuel for flames.
6 For a Child is born to us, a Son is given us,
and the sovereignty is upon his shoulder.
And they name him Wondrous Counsellor, Mighty God,
Father for ever, Prince of peace.
7 Vast is his principality,
and of peace there is no end.
On David's throne, and over his kingdom
he presides, to confirm and sustain it,
In judgment and justice, henceforth and for ever.
The zeal of Yahweh of Hosts will do this!

There are messianic prophecies in which the subduing of the kingdom's enemies is described to some extent in terms of forcible conquest. Resistless power is figured by physical coercion. But Isaias has divested Emmanuel of all trace of this. The oppressor's hated load and lash, even the last bloody relic of his devastation, has been destroyed before the Child appears. From birth itself he is acclaimed the wisest, the most firmly established, the most peace-bestowing of rulers. Is this fourth title actually "God of a warrior"? If so, what suggestion of his further prowess appears in verse 7? "The mighty God" alone is mighty enough to govern the world without "a war to end wars."

The absence of a "divine hero" is even more striking in Chapter 11, where Emmanuel stands before us in mature sovereignty. The source of all his power is a sevenfold Spirit of Yahweh, "resting upon him" as a permanent quality, not "coming mightily upon him," as at times upon Samson or Gedeon. His judgments are free from caprice, and the poor and lowly are their special wards. His only scepter is "the rod of his mouth"; his only enemies, "the

wicked" (*rasha'*), are slain by "the breath of his lips." Such peace pervades his kingdom that

> Then wolf shall be guest of lamb,
> and leopard with kid shall couch;
> And calf and lion and sheep shall herd,
> and a little child may be their driver.
> And the cow and the bear shall graze,
> their young shall rest together;
> and the lion shall eat hay like the ox.
> And the babe shall play by the cobra's den,
> and the child lay his hand on the viper's lair.
> They shall not harm nor destroy in all my holy mount;
> for the earth shall be full of knowledge of Yahweh
> like the waters that overspread the sea.

This achieved at home, his standard is "lifted up from the earth to draw all men." The Gentiles come, bringing with them the outcast of Israel and the dispersed of Juda. Philistia westward, Edom, Moab and Ammon eastward, become their subjects, while Juda and Ephraim are no more rivals. Yahweh Himself furthers the ingathering by expanding His frontiers. He dries up the Gulfs of Akaba and Suez, splits the Euphrates into brooklets with the blast of His wind, and makes a highway to the homeland from afar, even as He once did for the Exodus.

The oracles of the Emmanuel cycle are closely knit in theme. Nowhere do they betray the faintest hint of warlike conquest on the part of the Messiah. We are in the presence of a power which is not given a name. The manifestations of its exercise are wisdom, justice, judgment, irresistible persuasion, universal welcome, widespread and joyous recognition. Its center and source is the Spirit of Yahweh. And catching no note of trumpet or flash of sword, we search in bewilderment for "the divine hero," and wonder how the mere word "mighty" avails to intrude his presence into such a scene.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Md.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S DEFENSE OF THE HEXAEMERON AGAINST THE MANICHEANS

Rev. John P. Maher, O.S.A., S.T.L.

I

Introductory Essay*

Through the swift-flowing and, at times, turbulent course of the past fifteen centuries, Saint Augustine[1] has often been called the "Light of Doctors," and the "Tower of Intellectuality,"—and rightly so. The great Bishop of Hippo, to whom an all-wise God deigned to reveal the more hidden secrets of His divine wisdom, became, as it were, the new "cloud by day," and "pillar of fire by night," to lead men out of the abysmal depths of darkness and of error. The champion of truth and the guiding star for the people of his own day, he also proved to be a leader among leaders, even to the towering figures of the 13th, the greatest of centuries. "It is incredible," declares the historian Rémusat[2] refer-

* Editor's Note: This is the first of a series of articles on this topic by Fr. Maher.

[1] Aurelius Augustinus was born at Tagaste (now Souk-Ahras, to the south of Bone, Algeria), in proconsular Numidia, in North Africa, November 13, 354, of a pagan father, Patricius, and a saintly mother, Monica. He studied at Tagaste, and at Madaura, and, finally, at Carthage, where he learned of wisdom in the *Hortensius* of Cicero and inaugurated his famous search for truth. This quest led him to examine Sacred Scripture, whose simplicity of style and expression thereupon so shocked him that he turned to Manicheism. This sect claimed him for an auditor from his nineteenth to his twenty-eighth year. The leaders among the Manicheans could not resolve the difficulties attendant upon his insatiable thirst for truth and, although he maintained external relations with them even after his disappointment, his mind was removed far from them and their doctrines. In 383, he abandoned Africa and went to Rome, and thence to Milan to become professor of rhetoric. In the latter city, he came under the influence of Saint Ambrose, who baptized him in April, 387. On his return to his native Tagaste by way of Rome, Ostia, and Carthage, he sold his possessions and, after giving his money to the poor, dedicated himself to a life of fasting, prayer, and study. Though reluctant at first, he was ordained priest in 391 at Hippo by Valerius, the bishop of that city. Several years later, this same bishop, now grown old and infirm in health, had Augustine consecrated as his coadjutor and successor, probably in 396. Definitively, he succeeded Valerius as Bishop of Hippo in 397 and alone ruled the church of Hippo until his death thirty-three years later. He died, in his seventy-sixth year, the night of August 28, 430.

[2] Charles de Rémusat, *S. Anselme de Cantorbéry* (Paris: 1853), p. 476.

ring to Augustine, "to what extent this genius, so rich and so cultivated, has furnished ideas and theories to all the Doctors of the Middle Ages. Before we attribute to any of them the discovery of a new system, we should examine the works of the holy Father in order to ascertain whether the so-called new system is not found already explained in his writings."[3] Saint Anselm, Peter the Lombard, Alexander of Hales, Saint Bonaventure, and Saint Thomas, in their writings, furnish proof of the influence exerted on them by the genius of Augustine. There are, indeed, points on which the Tagastan differs radically from the Scholastics, yet Bossuet, the "Augustine of the Seventeenth Century," in discussing the relation between Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas, the Prince of Scholastics, expresses the following judgment: "Saint Thomas is Saint Augustine reduced to the Scholastic method. The later Doctor has acquired such a great name in the Church precisely because he was the faithful disciple of the earlier Master."[4] With merit, therefore, has Augustine been titled the "Light of Doctors,"and the "Tower of Intellectuality."

The superiority of mind, with which a special divine beneficence had endowed Augustine, would not permit him to be absorbed in the discussion of questions of minor importance, but rather urged him on to investigate the more difficult and more profound problems confronting human intelligence. Among these, there were two that held a special interest for him: the origin of nature, and the divine economy of grace. And since he, in investigating these, chose Sacred Scripture in preference to all other means of guidance, his findings on these fundamental questions constitute an interpretation of two sections of Holy Writ, viz., Genesis and the Epistles of Saint Paul.

OBJECT

It is not within the province of the present essay to treat of the conclusions of Augustine regarding the Pauline writings and the doctrine of grace. Its scope, rather, is a study of his investigations of Genesis, and of the origin of nature, and of the principal conclusions which he drew therefrom. More specifically, this study is confined to the work of the six days of creation, and to

[3] A. C. Vega, *Saint Augustine, His Philosophy,* authorized translation from the Spanish by D. J. Kavanagh (Philadelphia: 1931), p. 26.

[4] Jasques B. Bossuet, *Défense de la tradition et des saints Pères,* tome 2, *Œuvres complètes de Bossuet* (Paris: 1845), liv. V, chap. XXIV, p. 88.

his defense of the Mosaic account of the Hexaemeron against the calumnies of the Manicheans. The character of this study is historical, rather than exegetical, hence, no attempt is made to examine, according to the definite rules of strict exegesis, his interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. The end in view is to learn how the holy Doctor felt and what he thought about the Mosaic history of creation, in his interpretation of it against the attacks of Manes and his followers; how competently he knew the Manichean cosmogony; and how faithfully he handed down to posterity the Manichean teaching on the origin of nature.

IMPORTANCE

Because such limits have been placed on the subject matter designedly, it must not be thought that the theme under discussion is of inferior importance. One of the criteria for judging the mettle of an adversary is the solicitude of the champion who opposes him. Direct engagement with unimportant men and their inconsequential doctrines is beneath the dignity of the great protagonists of the cause of truth, according to the axiom: "Honor est in honorante." The care and anxiety that Augustine carried into the fray with the Manicheans are an index of his estimate of the danger in their fantastic tenets; the great store of his polemic writings, in refutation of their insidious doctrines, gives direct testimony to the disturbing influence of the sect on the life of not only the rude and uneducated, but even of the learned and cultured Christians of his day. Among other good effects, the errors of the sect provided him with the occasion for writing those books which constitute, according to the testimony of Paulinus,[5] the "Pentateuch against the Manicheans." These five great works are: *De libera arbitrio, De Genesi contra mani-*

[5] Paulinus, *Epistola 25 inter augustinianas*, Migne, *Patrologia Latina* [hereinafter abbreviated MPL] 33, 101.

N.B.—The *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* of Vienna (CSEL), so far as it has been edited up to the present, does not contain all the anti-Manichean works of Augustine. In consulting these works, the *Patrologia Latina* of Migne was used. In the opinion of those competent to judge in this matter, the CSEL is, in some volumes, "... not much of an improvement upon the Migne edition except from the standpoint of typography. Particularly is this true of the volume edited by Joseph Zycha." Some of the inconsistencies of Zycha are scored by J. S. McIntosh in *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis* (Chicago: 1912), pp. 11 and 12.

chaeos, De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae, De moribus manichaeorum and *De vera religione.*[6]

The importance of a discussion of the Manichean teachings becomes more apparent when one recalls that several of their errors, as, for instance: the belief in the existence of two distinct eternal principles, one the source of good, the other the source of evil; the denial of the free will of man, etc., often manifest themselves in one form or other in the assumptions of various modern sects, as they did in the teachings of the Albigenses of the thirteenth, and in those of the Jacobites of the fifteenth century, and in the doctrines of the Puritans of England and America.

An added motive of interest in the Manichean doctrines has been furnished in our own times by the comparatively recent discovery in Egypt of original documents bearing on these doctrines. In 1930, the famous Carl Schmidt roused the scientific world with his momentous discovery in Egypt of Coptic translations of the original writings of Manes.[7] As the learned professor of the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin remarked, the finding of this Coptic translation of original Manichean writtings causes "... research into Manicheism to be placed in an entirely new position."[8] Before the finding of original documents in Chinese Turkestan and in Egypt, the doctrines of the sect were known, for the most part, from the works of Christian writers, i.e., from secondary sources.

Among those who wrote against the sect, many great figures stand out. In the company of those to whom the Occidental World is indebted for its knowledge of Manicheism, Augustine holds a prominent place. As an auditor of the sect for nine years, the Tagastan gained first-hand information on the Manichean system. History testifies to the great use he made of this information; and the findings of those engaged in scientific research confirm more and more each day the value of his testimony and his authority on the doctrines of Manicheism.

His great figure, however, has been an object of attack by

[6] "Praefatio," MPL 42, 11-12.

[7] C. Schmidt und H. J. Polotsky, *Ein Mani-Fund in Aegypten* (Berlin: 1933).

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

certain writers, notably Beausobre[9] and Alfaric[10] who attempt to disparage his authority in the matter. These claim that the system of Manichean doctrines, as handed down to posterity by Augustine, does not correspond to historical fact, but rather represents these doctrines as colored and distorted by his prejudices. Wherefore, among the conclusions drawn from the present essay, not the least important is the vindication of Augustine as an authority on the teachings of Manes and his followers. The Bishop of Hippo knew these teachings well and transmitted them veraciously.

INVESTIGATION OF THE SOURCES

At the outset, the anti-Manichean works of Augustine, whence the material of this study is derived, must be investigated. In this investigation, a series of texts or passages from these works is not quoted "ad litteram," but rather a short description of these writings is given. From a brief consideration of their time of composition, their purpose, and their content, it is hoped that their relative importance in the solution of the problem may be judged.

The sources are considered in their strictly chronological order.[11] Proceeding in this manner makes it possible to recognize just how important Augustine considered the problem; at the same time, the opportunity presents itself of noting whether any development of his teaching against the sect took place in his mind.

Besides the works which he composed directly against the Manicheans, there are also others in which, here and there, he refutes them, though only in a general and an indirect fashion. These, too, are consulted wherever they throw light on the subject.

De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus manichaeorum libri II.[12] The holy Doctor began this work at Rome between the

[9] Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du manichéisme*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: 1734 et 1739).

[10] P. Alfaric, *L'évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin*, t. 1, *Du manichéisme au néoplatonisme* (Paris: 1918).

[11] Cf. *Retractationes*, "Prologus": MPL 32, 586; cf. also A. Casamassa, "*Agostino*," *Enciclopedia Italiana* (Milano-Roma: Treccani, 1929), pp. 916-20.

[12] MPL 32, 1309; cf. *Retract.* 1, 7: MPL 32, 591.

autumn of the year 387 and the month of August 388, and completed it in Africa afterward, probably at Tagaste in 389. In it, he draws a comparison between the morals of Catholics and those of the Manicheans. The complete work embraces fifty-five chapters: Thirty-five in the first book, and twenty in the second.

De libero arbitrio libri III.[13] These three books, begun at Rome in 388, were completed at Hippo after the year 391. In the opinion of the Benedictine Fathers of the Congregation of Saint Maurus, they were completed in 395.[14] Written in the form of a dialogue with Evodius, they treat of the origin of evil. In them, Augustine demonstrates that evil originates in free will.

De Genesi contra manichaeos libri II.[15] Augustine wrote this work in the solitude of his native city, Tagaste, about the year 389, i.e., almost two years after his conversion. In writing it, he had in mind a twofold end: as yet not ordained priest, he wished at one and the same time to confirm himself in his new faith and to confute the fantastic charges of the Manicheans.

This work is important because of its polemic value against the followers of Manes and also for its exposition of Catholic principles. It is the first writing of Augustine on the subject of Genesis, yet it cannot be considered as a strictly exegetical work. Indeed, its allegorical character is admitted by the author himself.[16]

The work consists of two books. In the first book, Augustine defends the Mosaic narration of the history of creation against the calumnies of the Manicheans. This book covers the entire first chapter and the first three verses of the second chapter of Genesis, and contains twenty-five chapters. In the second book, Augustine continues his defense of the Genesis account from the point where the hagiographer begins to describe the complementing of the work of the six days, down to the report on the banishment of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. This second book contains twenty-nine chapters, the last of which is a brief

[13] MPL 32, 1221; cf. *Retract.* 1, 9: MPL 32, 595.

[14] MPL 32, 1219-20: "Admonitio."

[15] MPL 34, 173; cf. *Retract.* 1, 10: MPL 32, 599. N.B.—This work and the three following were completed before *De libero arbitrio;* yet, because they were begun after 388, i.e., after *De libero arbitrio* was begun, they are here set down in their present order.

[16] *Retract.* 1, 18: MPL 32, 613.

resumé, in which Augustine compares the dogmas of the Church with the errors of the Manicheans.

De vera religione liber.[17] Augustine wrote this book at Tagaste about the year 390 and dedicated it to Romanianus. In it, he explains the history of the divine economy regarding salvation in such a manner that the errors of the Manicheans concerning the eternal principles and the two contrary natures are refuted anew.

De utilitate credendi liber.[18] This book was written about the year 391 at Hippo. It is the first polemic work composed by Augustine after his ordination to the priesthood.[19] He dedicated it to his friend Honoratus, who was groping in the darkness of Manicheism. In this book, Augustine demonstrates that faith is not blind.

De duabus animabus liber.[20] Augustine wrote this book at Hippo about the year 391 to refute the Manichean doctrine which held that in man there are two souls: one good, which is of the substance of God; the other evil, which proceeds from the realm of darkness and is not created by God.

Contra Fortunatum manichaeum liber.[21] This book is the record of the debate that took place at Hippo in the year 392 between Augustine and a Manichean priest named Fortunatus, who lived in the city. The question under discussion was the origin of evil. Augustine proved with valid arguments that evil originates in free will; to these arguments, his adversary could not respond. Defeated in the debate, Fortunatus departed from Hippo, nevermore to return.

Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulum liber.[22] Augustine wrote this book at Hippo about the year 394 to solve the apparent contradictions which Adimantus, a disciple of Manes, believed to exist between the Old and the New Testament.

Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti liber.[23] This book was written at Hippo about the year 397, Augustine having already been consecrated bishop. It was written to refute

[17] MPL 34, 121; cf. *Retract.* 1, 13: MPL 32, 602.
[18] MPL 42, 65; cf. *Retract.* 1, 14: MPL 32, 605.
[19] MPL 42, 11-12.
[20] MPL 42, 93; cf. *Retract.* 1, 15: MPL 32, 608.
[21] MPL 42, 111; cf. *Retract.* 1, 16: MPL 32, 612.
[22] MPL 42, 129; cf. *Retract.* 1, 22: MPL 32, 618.
[23] MPL 42, 173; cf. *Retract.* 2, 2: MPL 32, 631.

the principles contained in a letter which the Manicheans called their "Epistle of Foundation." This Epistle was written by Manes to one of his followers whose name probably was Patticus.[24] The work of Augustine comprises forty-three chapters.

Contra Faustum manichaeum libri XXXIII.[25] In the year 398 at Hippo, Augustine wrote this monumental work in defense of the Old and the New Testament. Of it Cassiodorus, in the first chapter of his *Institutiones divinarum litterarum,* averred: "Augustine also wrote thirty-three books against Faustus the Manichean, in which, with clear reasoning, he convicted him of the foulest depravity and, once again in a marvelous manner, discussed the book of Genesis."[26]

Of all the Manicheans known in the Western World, Faustus was the most famous.[27] He alone (excepting, of course, Manes), left to the world a great work. This work was of such importance to Augustine that, immediately recognizing its value, he forthwith set himself to the task of refuting it. He reconstructed each chapter of the work of Faustus before beginning its refutation; for this reason, the integral work of the famous Manichean has been conserved, though in detached portions.[28]

The work of Augustine comprises thirty-three books; book for chapter, it corresponds with the thirty-three chapters of the work of Faustus.

Contra Felicem manichaeum libri II.[29] In the eighth chapter of the second book of the *Retractations,*[30] Augustine wrote that

[24] MPL 42, 182; cf. note.

[25] MPL 42, 207; cf, *Retract.* 2, 7: MPL 32, 632.

[26] MPL 42, 205-6: "In subsequens opus."

[27] Cf. P. Monceaux, *Le manichéen Faustus dè Milev, restitution de ses capitula,* (Paris: 1924), p. 1.

[28] *Ibid,* p. 15.

[29] MPL 42, 519; cf. *Retract.* 2, 8: MPL 32, 633.

[30] *Loc. cit.* In the concluding paragraph of the Prologue to the *Retractations* (MPL 32, 586), Augustine declared that he would set down his works in the order in which they had been written. The Benedictine Fathers of the Congregation of Saint Maurus departed from this order because of special difficulty regarding *Contra Felicem.* Others, notably Tillemont and Portalié, followed the Benedictines in this departure. Monceaux, however, has demonstrated that the difficulty arose through an error in transcription. (Cf. *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,* séancedu 31 janvier, 1908, Paris, pp. 51-53.

When Augustine and Felix held their debate, Honorius was consul. This particular term of office of Consul Honorius is the crux of the difficulty.

Felix was one of the teachers of the Manicheans, uneducated, indeed, in the fine arts, yet, withal, more cunning than Fortunatus.

The disputation between Augustine and Felix, of which these two books form the record, took place at Hippo, December 7 and 12, 398. The subjects under discussion were: the mission of Manes, the immutability of God, the freedom of the human will in the performance of good or of evil, and the doctrine of the Redemption. At the close of the dispute, Felix declared himself defeated. Both he and Augustine anathematized the blasphemies of Manes and then signed the record of the debate.

De natura boni liber.[31] Augustine composed this book at Hippo in the year 399. In it, he demonstrates that all natures are good, that God is the Supreme Good and the Author of all created natures. He points out that, since evil is a defect of the good (*defectus boni*), an absolute principle of evil is impossible, for such a principle would have to be the negation of any good, hence, of any entity whatsoever; in other words, such a principle would have to be absolute nothing.

Contra Secundinum manichaeum liber.[32] The Bishop of Hippo wrote this book in his episcopal city in the year 399 in answer to a letter which Secundinus, a Manichean, sent to him. In that letter, Secundinus begged Augustine to desist from his attacks on the teachings of the Manicheans. (Here is an implicit tribute to the valor of the Saint on the field of battle against the Manicheans; unable to vanquish him, they beg him off.) The answer of Augustine was the present work in which he refuted the Manichean doctrines that Secundinus advanced in his letter.

De haeresibus liber.[33] Augustine composed this work at Hippo in 428-29 at the request of Quodvultdeus, a deacon of Carthage. Originally, he planned it in two parts. In the first part, he describes the heresies that sprang up after the coming of Christ,

---

In almost all manuscripts of the works of Augustine, this term of office is designated by the numeral six (VI) instead of the correct number, four (IV). Such an error, or slip of the pen, can easily be explained, especially where Roman numerals have been transcribed. Accordingly, the correct position of *Contra Felicem* and the strictly chronological order of the works of Augustine as set down in the *Retractations* (MPL 32), are to be restored, as already effected for the first time by Casamassa in the *Enciclopedia Italiana,* vol. I, "Agostino," pp. 916-20.

[31] MPL 42, 551; cf. *Retract.* 2, 9: MPL 32, 634.

[32] MPL 42, 577; cf. *Retract.* 2, 10: MPL 32, 634.

[33] MPL 42, 21.

or rather, after His Ascension into heaven. Listing eighty-eight of these, and drawing on Eusebius, Epiphanius, and his own personal knowledge, he sets down accurate descriptions of the heresies and heresiarchs from Simon Magus to Pelagius and Celestius. Forty-sixth on the list is a thorough outline of Manicheism.

De haeresibus remains incomplete, for it lacks the second part in which Augustine, as he promised,[34] intended to show "what constitutes a heretic."

The above-mentioned works constitute the sources from which the material of this study is drawn. There are, indeed, other works in which Augustine treats of the errors of Manicheism—but only indirectly, and, as it were, in passing. They are not many, not of great importance to the purpose of this study, and occur only where the Tagastan declaims against error in general. Reference to these will be made when the occasion seems to require it.

METHOD

The method employed in drawing the material of this study from the sources indicated above is the historical method, or, more specifically, the analytico-synthetic method.

First in order, the defense of the work of the six days of creation against the Manicheans is considered objectively, i.e., just as Augustine proposed it. Through an analysis of this defense, a knowledge is sought of the Manichean teaching on the origin of things. This latter doctrine is then compared with the Manichean cosmogony as described in the original documents (the *Kephalaia*) recently discovered in Egypt. Next, an attempt is made to explain any discrepancies between the account related by Augustine and that set down by Manes. Finally, all the elements are collected into a compact whole.

While the anti-Manichean writings of Augustine and the *Kephalaia* of Manes are of primary and greatest importance to the purpose of the present study, this fact does not prevent the citing of other authors who wrote well and to the point on the same subject.

Augustinian College
Washington, D. C.

[34] MPL 42, 23.

THE PROPHECIES ON HOLY SATURDAY

Rev. William J. Lallou, S.T.D.

A correct understanding of the services of Holy Saturday is dependent upon keeping constantly in mind that these ceremonies do not properly belong to the morning of Holy Saturday but to an all-night watch service beginning the evening of that day and concluding with the Mass of the Resurrection around dawn on Easter Sunday morning.* Reasons of convenience dictated the anticipation of these ceremonies, until they have reached their present time of performance resulting in the incongrous celebration of the Easter Mass a good twenty hours before, in strict chronology, it is due. The night-long vigil accounts for the lengthy services at the close of which the Mass of the Resurrection came originally with an *a propos,* which it lacks to-day. For centuries it was the impression that Christ, at His second coming, would appear on Easter Eve and the faithful naturally desired to be found watching and praying when He came. As the idea of the Parousia became more and more that of an advent in the remote future, the Easter vigil became anticipated earlier and earlier, until it reached Saturday morning, where it has been observed for centuries.

The ritual of Holy Saturday is divided into four sections: (1) the service of the fire and the candle; (2) the reading of the Prophecies; (3) the blessing of the font and the Baptism of the catechumens; (4) the Mass of the Resurrection. It is with the second section of these ceremonies that this article has to deal. Long and wearisome as is this portion of the Holy Saturday rites, it must be understood as the survival of the all-night watch when lengthy readings from Scripture were indicated to occupy the hours of vigil. Indeed, when the night service was held, much longer extracts from the Bible were read and they were read twice, being repeated in Greek after the first reading in

* The following authorities have been consulted: Ildefonso Shuster, *The Sacramentary,* English translation from the Italian (London: 1924); P. Gueranger, *The Liturgical Year,* translated from the French by Dom Laurence Shephard, 15 Vols. (Dublin, 1886); Herbert Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week* (London: 1914); Archdale King, *Notes on Catholic Liturgies* (New York: 1930); L. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien* (Paris: 1925) C. Atchely, *The Ambrosian Liturgy* (London: 1909); *The Gelasian Sacramentary,* ed. by H. A. Wilson (Oxford: 1894).

Latin. According to some authorities, the Greek version was read first. We now refer to the twelve lessons of the Holy Saturday rites as Prophecies, though, as a matter of fact, only six are from the Prophetical Books, though all possess prophetic reference to the coming of the Messias. In ancient times, when a selection from the Old Testament always preceded the Epistle, it was known as the Prophet, from whatever source it was derived. The readings are not introduced by any title and only three, the fourth, the eighth, and the eleventh, are followed by scriptural selections, designated as Tracts. These responsories, to use the usual term for such appendages to lessons, are peculiar in that they are not taken from the Book of Psalms, as is the general practice, but from other books of the Old Testament, namely, Exodus, Isaias, and Deuteronomy. This fact has been remarked as indicating a heritage from the old Synagogue service, from which the Christian fore-Mass synaxis developed. The Prophecies are followed by prayers, introduced by the customary invitation to prayer, *Oremus,* and the deacon's command to kneel for private prayer, *Flectamus genua,* after which the celebrant summarizes the petitions of the faithful in a prayer, called the collect for this reason. The collects after the lessons of Holy Saturday usually express some connection between the scriptural selection just read and the Baptism about to be administered.

While the lessons were being read from the ambo, illuminated by the great Paschal candle, the catechumens assembled in the porch of the church for the final preparations for their Baptism. These completed, they also entered the church to listen to the Prophecies and join in the prayers and the singing of the Tracts. Even to-day the Missal contains a rubric directing that during the reading of the lessons the catechumens may be catechized and otherwise prepared for Baptism. Hence, it is not quite accurate to say that the Prophecies were introduced solely for the instruction of the candidates for Baptism. They were intended likewise, and even principally, for the edification of the faithful generally during the night-long vigil. For this we may quote Father Thurston (*Lent and Holy Week,* p. 427), "That these prophecies had no essential connection with the instruction of the catechumens, but were simply intended to open the minds and hearts of the whole assembly to the new creation typified in the Easter mystery, may fairly be inferred from the fact that this portion

of the service is still retained even in churches which have no baptismal font."

The series of Prophecies on Holy Saturday opens quite logically with the beginning of the book of Genesis, of which the first chapter and the opening verses of the second chapter are read. An account of creation is appropriately found first among the instructions for the faithful, for whom Eastertide is a renewal of grace and for the catechumens, for whom the Paschal-time Baptism is a re-creation in spiritual regeneration. The collect, which follows the lesson, conveys the idea of the correlation of creation and redemption. The second scriptural selection is likewise from Genesis and tells the story of Noe and the deluge. The waters of destruction have become the agent of mercy and salvation in Baptism and the ark, in which Noe and his family were saved, is a symbol of the Church floating safely on the waters of sin and infidelity. The succeeding collect gives praise to God for the Sacrament of renewal and restoration through the waters of Baptism. The third prophecy takes us to the twenty-second chapter of Genesis, where we read the account of Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac. This is a clear type of the action of God the Father who delivered up His only-begotten Son as a sacrifice for the salvation of mankind. The collect invokes the comparison between the promised multiplying of the seed of Abraham and the calling of the nations of the earth to participate in the adoption of sons through Baptism. The fourth lesson turns to the Book of Exodus to relate the story of the miraculous passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea. This leads to the first of the Tracts, continuing from Exodus, which is the hymn of Moses in thanksgiving to God for having delivered the chosen people from the slavery of Egypt. The collect celebrates the divine mercy extended to man under the New Law in his passage through the waters of the font from the bondage of sin to the freedom of the sons of God.

The fifth lesson, taken from Isaias, is the first selection from the writings of a Prophet. Isaias, with prophetic voice, calls the nations to the saving waters to contemplate the inheritance which God has provided for them. The collect prays that we of the Church may realize that the promises made to the fathers of the Old Law have found fulfillment in the realities of the New. The sixth reading is again really a Prophecy, taken this time from Baruch. The inspired writer enquires what man has gained by

merely human culture as compared with the riches of the knowledge of God as bestowed upon Jacob His servant and Israel His beloved child. The collect asks for the divine protection of the multitudes of diverse nations, who have been washed in the waters of Baptism. The seventh text remains in the prophetical writings and is taken from the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezechiel. It is the macabre vision of the plain on which the dry bones were scattered until the Spirit of God joined them together and clothed them with flesh and skin and breathed life into them. Proximately, the prophecy was of the deliverance of the Jews from the death of captivity, but it likewise foretold the effect of the revivifying grace of Baptism. The following collect contrasts the Passover and the Paschal Sacrament, each in its own measure a guarantee of the gifts of grace. The eighth lesson is from Isaias, the brief fourth chapter of that book, which predicts the abrogation of the Law of Moses and the substitution of the Law of Christ. As the manpower of Israel will be so reduced that seven women will seek the protection of one man, so many nations will ally themselves to the one spouse, Jesus Christ. The prophecy, this time again properly so called, has as its tract the opening verses of the following chapter of Isaias, the fifth, which is a hymn of lamentation for the desolate state to which the Jews have reduced their nation, which was the Lord's own vineyard. The collect, continuing the metaphor of the vineyard, prays for the fruitful growth of those who constitute the garden of the Lord under the New Dispensation.

For the ninth lesson, we return to the Book of Exodus, to hear again this morning the initial reading of the Good Friday services, which relates the story of the Paschal lamb and the Passover supper, which was to be eaten as by men about to start on a journey. The collect reminds us that the Paschal lamb was the type of the immolation of Christ, our new Pasch. As the sword of the avenging angel was averted by the eating of the Paschal lamb and the marking of the door-posts with its blood, so the catechumens will be preserved from eternal death when, through Baptism, they acquire the right to partake of the flesh and blood of the Lamb of God in the supper of the Holy Eucharist. The tenth lesson is again a prophecy, this time from Jonas, relating how penance at the preaching of the prophet transformed Niniveh from a city of abomination to a city of God's elect. So the catechumens, by birth children of Niniveh, will become by Bap-

tism children of the heavenly Jerusalem. The collect, without reference to the preceding selection from Jonas, begs for unity of faith and concord of action among all those who have been called to an eternal inheritance by membership in the one Church. The eleventh lesson reverts to the Pentateuch, to Deuteronomy, where are recorded the words written by Moses by divine command when the days of his death were nigh. They are severe words reprehending the people for their infidelity and prophesying their wickedness after his death. The third and last of the Tracts follows this eleventh reading and consists of the opening verses of the canticle of Moses spoken by him before he went to die in the land of Moab. This great canticle is a survival from the Hebrew Sabbath service and reminds the catechumens of the grave character of their baptismal vows as they listen to the words of Moses telling of God's punishment of those who break the covenants which are made with Him. The collect prays that we may escape, through the remission of sins, the vengeance threatened by Moses to the unfaithful. The twelfth, and final, prophecy, taken from the third chapter of Daniel, relates the familiar story of the three young men consigned to the fiery furnace by Nabuchodonosor. The inclusion of this reading is usually explained by the desire of the Church to remind those about to be baptized that they may have to pass the test of fire in the profession of their new faith as did Sidrach and Misach and Abdenago. The collect, without particular reference to the preceding Prophecy, is a general prayer that we may learn the lessons conveyed by the teaching of the prophets.

A subject of great discussion has been the omission of the *Flectamus genua,* and consequently of the *Levate* also, after the *Oremus* invitation to prayer following the twelfth prophecy. There are some authorities who claim that the omission is due to the refusal of the three young men to bend the knee before the idol which King Nabuchodonosor had set up. A more plausible explanation, as it seems to us, is that anciently, by the time this lesson had been read, the sun had already set and it was not considered proper to kneel when the eve of Sunday had begun, especially the eve of this Sunday of the Resurrection, since it was the custom to pray standing in commemoration of the rising of our Lord from the tomb during Eastertide and on Sundays throughout the year. As a matter of fact, there is no *Flectamus genua* after the lessons of the Pentecost Ember Week, which

naturally occurs during the Paschal season. Against this explanation it may be urged that when the service was an all-night vigil, not only this last lesson but all the previous ones would have been recited after the sunset of Saturday and yet the *Flectamus genua* is retained for the others. Perhaps, however, this was peculiar to the Easter watch service, which would commemorate the resting of our Lord's body in the sepulchre until around dawn of Easter Sunday, which would be about the time of the twelfth lesson, the traditional hour of the Resurrection.

The retention of the twelve lessons on Holy Saturday is a feature of the Roman Rite. In some of the derived monastic rites, as in those of the Carthusians and Dominicans, there are only four prophecies. In this, these rites agree with the Gallican survivals of Lyons and Braga.

Each of these lessons is followed by a chant and a collect. The Ambrosian Liturgy has six lessons from the Old Testament in this section of the Holy Saturday services. Each lesson has its chant and its collect. A *psalmellus* is sung after the first, second, and fifth lessons, the canticle of the three children coming after the third lesson, the song of Miriam after the fourth, and a *cantus* after the sixth. It may be noted that the usual first lesson of the Mass, the Prophet, is omitted in the Holy Saturday Mass of the Ambrosian Rite. The six lessons read in this liturgy are the first, third, ninth, fourth (not entirely identical with ours), and fifth of the Roman Missal, and a final lesson, taken from Isaias (1:16-19).

It may be of interest here to remark that when the services of Holy Saturday are repeated in more condensed form on the Eve of Pentecost, six prophecies are read, the ones selected being the third, the fourth, the eleventh, the eighth, the sixth, and the seventh of the Holy Saturday series. On the four Ember Saturdays during the year, the fifth lesson is always a portion of the story of the three young men in the fiery furnace, not the longer extract read on the Eve of Easter but the concluding portion of the narrative, beginning twenty-three verses beyond the final prophecy of Holy Saturday that it may lead directly to the canticle, *Benedictus es,* of which, however, never more than five verses are read.

Durandus (*Rationale,* VI, 81) tells us that in his time, the thirteenth century, the number of lessons in the Holy Saturday services varied in different places. There were instances of as few

as four or as many as fourteen of these prophecies, while in some places six and in others twelve were read. As an index of the antiquity of the selection of these readings, we may note that the Gelasian Sacramentary mentions ten prophecies. Being a Sacramentary and not a Lectionary, the Gelasian book naturally does not give us the text of the portions read but indicates the sources from which they were taken. The collects at that time evidently came *before* the prophecies instead of following them as they do to-day and have done for centuries. The Gelasian Sacramentary gives us the following order for the Prophecies in its "Orationes per singulas lectiones in Sabbato Sancto": our first, second, third, and fourth, the last being followed, as at present, by the canticle, *Cantemus Domino;* our fifth, seventh, and eighth, the last leading to the tract, *Vinea facta est,* as to-day; our ninth, eleventh (with the song of Moses), and twelfth. The two omitted, therefore, are the selection from Baruch, in the sixth place in the Roman Missal, and the story of the preaching of Jonas to the Ninevites, the tenth of our readings.

An endeavor to trace the history of the choice of the prophecies which have remained in the Roman Missal would furnish an interesting study but one which is beyond the scope of the present paper. It would be a work fraught with the difficulties which have, up to date, perplexed all those who have striven to account for the sequence of lessons read as the Epistles and Gospels in the Mass and probably just as inconclusive.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE FORM-CRITICS, THE GOSPELS, AND ST. PAUL

Rev. Stephen E. Donlon, S.J., S.T.D.

II

In the reconstruction made by the Form-critics the early Christian communities which produced the "gospel before the Gospels" are portrayed as 1) eschatological in thought and outlook to such an extent that the eschatological tension made it impossible for them to lead normal lives, to show capacity or inclination for writing, or to exercise ordinary carefulness in recording the actual sequence of events; 2) uncontrolled by any recognized hierarchical institutions, such as we see later in the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch; 3) seeking laws of life in the words and deeds of Jesus; 4) essentially creative, producing the Jesus of their dreams and aspirations while unconsciously transforming originally historical accounts; 5) autonomous, holding some, perhaps many, common viewpoints but developing themselves and their beliefs in accordance with the vital needs and urges that were felt in each of the more important centers of Christian life.[1]

Does this reconstruction square with the concept of the Christian communities to be gained from St. Paul, acknowledged on all sides as the most accredited source of information for these communities at this period? That is the problem which now engages us. And lest we become involved in disputes over the authenticity of some of the letters traditionally attributed to St. Paul, and because these four letters provide us with a sufficiently broad and solid basis for study, we shall confine ourselves to the so-called Great Epistles—Romans, the two Corinthians, and Galatians. That these four Epistles are really works from the hand of the Apostle of the Gentiles, composed between the years 50 and 65 A.D., there is today no dispute among reputable scholars.[2]

[1] An explanation of these terms and citations from works of prominent Form-critics indicating that these are, in their mind, important characteristics of the Christian communities of the Apostolic age, can be found in the article "Form-critics, The Gospels, and St. Paul" in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (Vol VI, no. 2, April, 1944, pp. 170-179).

[2] Cf. E. B. Allo, O.P., *Saint Paul, Première Épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1936), p. lxvii; *Saint Paul, Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1937), p. xlix; M. J. Lagrange, O.P., *Saint Paul, Épître aux Romains* (Paris: Gabalda, 1916), pp. lxi-lxii; R. Cornely, S.J.,

About the date of the composition of these four Epistles there is, so far as this study is concerned, no dispute of any moment. It is interesting to note how early a date is given by Kirsopp and Silva Lake in their work, *An Introduction to the New Testament.*[3] Galatians they refuse to date since they feel its date too uncertain, but for the others they give as their conclusion: 1 Corinthians around 50 A.D., 2 Corinthians around 51 A.D. (though they consider the last four chapters as a little earlier than the first nine chapters), and Romans in its present ("long") form about 52 A.D.[4] Whether the Great Epistles be put quite this early or not,[5] they all still fall within the period with which we are concerned.

We have then in the Pauline Epistles unquestioned and unquestionable material for the study of the life within the Christian communities during just those years when the tradition which we see finally crystallized in the Gospels was forming it-

Commentarius in S. Pauli Epistolas, III; *Epistolae ad Corinthios Altera et ad Galatas* (Cursus Scripturae Sacrae; Paris: Lethielleux, 1909); J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des N. Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek, 1907), Zweiter Band, p. 1; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *First Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1911), pp. xvi-xvii. Because of the importance of the First Epistle to the Corinthians for our study, I append the citation from Robertson and Plummer: "It is not necessary to spend much time upon the discussion of this question [the authenticity of the First Corinthians]. Both the external and the internal evidence for the Pauline authorship are so strong that those who attempt to show that the Apostle was not the writer succeed chiefly in proving their own incompetence as critics.... The captious objections which have been urged against one or other, or even against all four of the great Epistles of St. Paul by Bruno Bauer (1850-52) and more recently by Loman, Pierson, Naber, Edwin Johnson, Meyboom, von Manen, Rudolf Steck, and others have been sufficiently answered by Kuenen, Scholten, Schmiedel, Zahn, Gloël, Wrede, and Lindemann.... More than sixty years ago, F. C. Baur said of the four chief Epistles that 'they bear so unmistakably the character of Pauline originality that there is no conceivable ground for the assertion of critical doubts in their case.'"

[3] This work was published in 1937 by Harper and Brothers, New York. The citation in the text is taken from pages 100-101.

[4] Regarding the date of Galatians, Father Prat, *La Théologie de Saint Paul,* I, pp. 560-561, groups it chronologically with the other Great Epistles as later than the two to the Thessalonians and earlier than the Epistles of the Captivity.

[5] Many authorities put these Epistles about five years later, around 57-58 A.D. It is beyond the range of this paper to enter into a dispute about the exact dates of these letters.

self. Nowhere else can we hope to find so clear and so detailed a picture of the real *Sitz im Leben.* Do these Epistles present us with a sociological stratum in which undisciplined creative elements, unconfined by historical judgment, evolved a Christ in whom it hypostatized its aspirations, religious needs, and social ideals?

First, then, do the Great Epistles portray communities dominated by the concept of an early consummation of the present world-order with the second and glorious coming of Jesus Christ? The problem thus enunciated is closely connected with the general question of Pauline eschatology.[6] However, the place of the final consummation in Paul's general theological thought is not the question here and now. Even the question whether de facto Paul expected the Parousia in his own lifetime does not precisely concern us. What we wish to discover is whether Paul and the Gentile Christians of the period from 35 to 70 A.D. were so dominated by the thought of the approaching consummation to the present order of things that they could not lead normal lives, could have no interest in preserving the memory of past events with anything like historical accuracy. Before any discussion it should be clear that it is one thing to hope for or expect an event of cataclysmic proportions within the lifetime of persons now living and quite another to be so tense under the spell of that expectation that one cannot lead a normal human life and preserve fundamentally accurate records of past events. The Form-critic needs to establish more than a mere expectation on the part of the first generation Christians. He must establish a state of mental distortion and tension induced by this expectation. What evidence for such a state of things is to be found in the Great Epistles? What indications are there, either in the form of *direct* expressions bearing on the Day of the Lord, the Parousia, and equivalent terms or (and this may easily be more important) in the form of plans, directions, condemnation of abuses, which only *indirectly* indicate the prevailing temper not only of Paul, but of the Christians whom he addresses?

[6] A very good idea of the mass of material on the subject of Pauline eschatology can be gotten from the index of works chiefly consulted to be found in Friedrich Guntermann's scholarly *Die Eschatologie des heiligen Paulus* (*Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen,* XIII, Münster i. W.: 1932). This work, presented as a dissertation to the Catholic Faculty at the University of Bonn, was published in 1932 with episcopal imprimatur.

We might concede that in most places in the four Epistles with which we are concerned where Paul speaks directly of the Parousia, he speaks rather in the sense of one who thinks it possible enough that he may still be living at the second coming. After all we must remember that Christ's own words left the actual time of His coming altogether uncertain[7] and the signs preceding it were to be such that they would be much clearer after the event than before it. What was and is always true is that Christ may come within the present generation. We, today, after two thousand years of interval, are not inclined to put the second coming much closer than another two thousand, but we may be as far off in our calculations as the early Christians, some of whom may have felt that another score of years would close the present economy.[8]

It is not the Catholic contention that Paul's direct utterances clearly indicate that the second coming was remote. The conclusion of one Catholic scholar on the passages directly concerned with the Parousia is this:[9]

> All the Epistles agree with our previously established conclusions in this that the Parousia was expected in the near future. Nowhere do we find a single indication that generation after generation should elapse before that event. No passage forces us to go beyond the present or the next generation.

And in the same place, in answer to the question whether Paul expected to live to see with his own eyes the second coming, Dr. Guntermann remarks that while in the First Epistle to the

[7] Mk. 13:32; Acts 1:7.

[8] It may appear special pleading to consider the question of the Parousia in St. Paul, without reviewing the Thessalonian incident. But, granting that there was excessive tension there, I still contend, 1) that it was local and quickly settled; 2) what is more important, that, if the expectation was nearly so general as Form-critics would have us believe, then signs of it should appear unmistakably in so large and important a cross-section of Pauline literature as the four Great Epistles. So also Father Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, I, (London: Burns, Oates, 1933), p. 83: "Everything leads us to believe that all anxieties about the imminence of the Parousia were quickly allayed. We do not see that they manifested themselves elsewhere, perhaps because they arose from local circumstances in Thessalonica, or because the Apostle, taught by experience, took care thereafter to prevent all misunderstanding."

[9] Guntermann, *Die Eschatologie des heiligen Paulus*, B, *Die Parusie*, IV, Der Zeitpunkt der Wiederkunft Christi, pp. 84-85. His conclusions in the "Zusammenfassender Rückblick" are based on all the letters.

Thessalonians and the First to the Corinthians he appears to have that hope, we see him in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians reckoning with the opposite possibility, and in the Epistle to the Philippians he even expresses the wish to be dissolved and to be with Christ. The reason for this change of attitude the author attributes to the passing of several decades during which many other Christians who shared Paul's hope had died and to the many dangers through which Paul had passed and in which he had barely escaped death.

Father Prat[10] who is more moderate in his admissions than Guntermann, answers his own question "Did Paul share the common illusion [of the Christians of the apostolic age who believed that they were approaching the end of the world]?" in this way:

> In principle there is nothing to prevent his having done so, for inspiration does not impart universal knowledge and could not in any case have given him the knowledge of the last day, which the heavenly Father had reserved to Himself. Apart from the truth of which he is the depositary, the sacred writer can be ignorant, hesitate, base an opinion on probabilities or likelihoods, and set out in search of the truth by using the means which all men have at their disposition. The essential thing is that he should not teach error. Paul, knowing better than anyone that the date of the last day by no means forms the object of revelation, does not teach that the world is about to end; he even declares solemnly that the consummation of things is not imminent; but for want of special light on the subject he abides by the statement of the Gospel. Nevertheless, he does not seem to look forward to a long series of centuries. Doubtless, those words "We who are alive and remain shall go to meet the Lord" (1 Thess. 4:7) exclude any premature judgment of the matter, for the Church will not perish and all Christians can identify themselves with it as if they were to witness its triumphs and its trials personally in a distant future. Nevertheless, would the Apostle have spoken thus if he had a clear knowledge of the fact that thousands of years separated him from the end?

Of the principal places in the Great Epistles where St. Paul is or is said to be directly concerned with the Parousia[11] two at least seem to betray the sanguine hopes of one who has witnessed

[10] *The Theology of Saint Paul*, I, pp. 75-76.

[11] These are seven in number: Rom. 13:11,12; 1 Cor. 1:7,8; 4:5; 7:29-31; 10:11; 15:51; 2 Cor. 5:1-10. For the Catholic interpretation of these verses, the reader may consult amongst others the Commentaries in the Cursus Sacrae Scripturae, those of Fr. Lagrange, O.P., on Romans and Galatians, and of Fr. Allo, O.P., on the two Corinthians, and Fr. Prat's *Theology of Saint Paul.*

a critical turning-point in the economy of events leading to the final consummation. The first of these is in Romans[12] where Paul writes "Now our salvation is nearer than when we believed." Guntermann[13] insists that if these words of the Apostle do more than merely mark the obvious, they indicate some substantial advance toward the second coming. But a substantial advance can be understood in two ways: either in a purely quantitative way, as Guntermann seems to understand it, or in a partly qualitative way. In this second sense Paul would have found the substantial advance in the fulfillment of some important prognostic of the Parousia. The same attitude of Paul's is, I think, found in a second passage, where, in addressing his Corinthians[14] and summing up his directions to the married and to virgins, Paul begins: "This therefore I say brethren: the time is short." Here the English (Rheims-Douay) translation based on the Vulgate "Tempus breve est" may be gravely misleading. St. Paul says not that the time is short, but that it has been contracted, curtailed, lessened.[15] Had Paul wished to state simply that the time was short, Greek provided him with means for doing so. But if Paul was thinking in terms of some important corner turned, of some significant development in the general world order in which he saw the fulfilment of another stage in the preparation for the final triumph of the Messias, then we can understand why he chose a mode of speaking that

[12] Rom. 13:11.

[13] *Die Eschatologie*, p. 77.

[14] 1 Cor. 7:29.

[15] Father Allo in his commentary on this verse says, "the (measure of) time has been contracted, compressed." Guntermann, *Die Eschatologie*, p. 55, translats "the time is compressed (zusammengedrängt), reduced (verkleinert), curtailed (abgekürzt). Robertson-Plummer (*First Corinthians*, p. 154) paraphrase the expression "The allotted time has been drawn together, so as to be small in amount." W. Bauer in the second (1928) edition of his *Griechische-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, sub voce*, 'sustello' remarks on this passage that it remains doubtful whether there is reference to a divine decree of curtailment (so J. Weiss) or whether the Greek participle refers as little as the German "gedrungen" to an originally more extended period. Fr. Zorell, S.J., in his *Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum* (Paris: 1911) in the Cursus Scripturae Sacrae under the same word translates "tempus contractum est, i.e., breve est" and then adds "breve tempus homini a Deo concessum est, quo majore cum diligentia ad eum finem adhibeatur, ad quem concessum est."

brought the goal into brighter prospect without measuring too nicely the intervening distance. This explanation is made the more acceptable when we recall the discussion in 2 Thessalonians[16] where Paul catalogues the signs that shall precede the day of the Lord. There we see that Paul had received revelations in this matter which, though obscure to us, were clear enough to him. From his statements there we know that the mystery of iniquity was even then operative, though restrained. Paul himself may easily have recognized in some event or series of events a loosening of the bonds that bind the wicked one and then have argued that the final struggle had been brought substantially close: he does not know when the end will come; he does warn his Christians that the time has been contracted, and he is quite within his rights in using that knowledge to warn them that they "should learn how to sit loose to all earthly ties."[17]

We who are living in a period that has felt the high hopes engendered by the victory at Midway, the expulsion of the German forces from Africa, the successful defense of Stalingrad, the first foothold gained by American forces on continental Europe, who have heard lively discussions of the question whether we have reached "the end of the beginning" or "the beginning of the end," should be able to appreciate the feelings of Paul and the Christians of his time who had witnessed such turning-points in the history of salvation as the public life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the preaching of salvation to the Gentile world as the Jewish people rejected it, and the promising first fruits of Gentile Christianity. Expectations run high whenever we turn a corner in a long struggle. And we greet with enthusiasm as Paul did "the last hour," even though we know, as he did, that last hours, no matter how auspiciously ushered in, have a way of tarrying beyond their welcome.[18]

[16] 2 Thess. 2:3-10.

[17] Robertson-Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

[18] Without going into further discussion of the other passages in the Great Epistles in which the Parousia is directly treated, it is to be noted that if Paul in the 2d Corinthians had for the first time considered the possibility of his own dissolution before that event, he should have given a fuller explanation of his change of attitude. (Cf. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, I, p. 76.) Had his Christians been nurtured on the sure expectation of the coming within their lifetime, they should certainly have expected and deserved an explanation. We know absolutely from that letter (2 Cor. 1:12–2:17) that some of the Corinthians were already accusing

In regard then to the passages in the Great Epistles which deal directly with the Parousia, we conclude that, while that event was more in Paul's thought than in ours, he by no means committed himself to a position not in harmony with that ignorance of the day and the hour in which Christ left mankind.

But there are other passages in these Epistles, not directly referring to the Parousia, from which we can infer Paul's own attitude on the duration of the Messianic times as well as the general attitude of the early Christian communities.

In the first place, we may ask ourselves whether the vigor of his attack on those judaizing elements which insisted that the Mosaic yoke be imposed on Christian shoulders was not due in part to a long-term view of things. One need not deny that Paul's principal grievance against the judaizers was that they jeopardized what for Paul was the one truth that could never be overemphasized: that through Christ and through Christ alone we have justification and the hope that springs from justification. Still, it seems not improbable that Paul should have corrected the Jewish concept of the function of the Law,[19] made the Jewish converts realize its transitory and pedagogic nature, and then left them free to preserve it, at least in part, as a precious heirloom, for indeed he never faltered in his clear affirmation that the Law was in itself good, from God, and a privilege.[20] And if the Parousia was at hand, it would seem to have been sufficient to have corrected the mistaken notion of the efficacy of the Law. Why then insist on its complete abrogation? I think that we must acknowledge as part of the answer that Paul realized that it was after all the civic and religious code of one people, unadapt-

---

Paul of fickleness and inconstancy in dealing with them and we see Paul at special pains to clear himself of all charges of duplicity. Is it likely that in this same letter he would veer in a doctrine so important, without adding a word of apology for his conduct? The only plausible reconstruction is that Paul had never led them to believe that the Lord's second coming was to occur without fail in his lifetime or theirs, but had warned them as he would warn us: "Watch, for you know not the hour."

[19] For a very splendid treatment on Paul's position on the abrogation of the Law, one may consult Pere Lagrange's "Note sur l'abrogation de la Loi" (pp. 180-188) in his Commentary on Romans.

[20] Such is the tone of the opening of the ninth chapter of Romans, in which the Law is numbered along with the Adoption, the *Shekkinah*, the Covenant, the Promises, the Patriarchs, and Christ Himself, "qui est super omnia Deus benedictus," as the glorious prerogatives of the Jewish people.

able to others. It was of its nature a wall, a barrier, which kept Israel from contact with her neighbors. The rite of circumcision, so ridiculous to the Gentile world, the matrimonial customs, the prohibitions in food could never become the rule of life of all peoples. As long as any section of the Christian commonwealth preserved such restrictions, it could never hope for easy commerce and fraternity with other sections. But, certainly, Paul did not expect to break down in a generation the deep-seated prejudices of Jew for Gentile uncleanness. So had he been convinced that the present order was to be dissolved within a few years he would have preferred to put up with this basis for division and dispute rather than antagonize the Jewish element by insisting on the abrogation of the Mosaic Law. But, in the hypothesis that he foresaw the possibility of the present arrangement reaching out into a distant future, then his decision to risk present antagonism to insure future unity in the Mystical Body is readily intelligible. Paul laid his foundations deep, for he looked to an enduring structure.

Again, in Romans[21] we have the promise that Israel, which at present has suffered rejection because of its blindness, will eventually obtain mercy. But there is not the slightest reason to see how Paul could have dreamed that the "plenitudo Gentium" would enter the Church and then that Israel as a whole would be converted within his lifetime or several more lifetimes. The indications at the moment were that for the time being the Jews as a group had rejected Christ, and, though Paul's ministry among the Gentiles had been fruitful, the "plenitudo Gentium" was still pagan.[22] Paul's vision must have extended far beyond

[21] The whole eleventh chapter is devoted to the revelation of this mystery, which is made explicitly in vv. 25-27.

[22] It is impossible to get accurate figures on the number converted by Paul. Karl Pieper in his *Paulus, Seine Missionarische Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen XIII Band, 1.–2. Heft; Münster i. W.: 1926), p. 197, writes: We ought, certainly, to conceive no exaggerated notions about the size of the Pauline communities. When Vidal, for example, speaks of the "immense success" of Paul's preaching, he overstates the evidence. On the other hand it is incorrect to take with Weinel, and Preuschen-Kruger, and others the opposite position, i.e., to represent the really tangible results of Paul's apostolate as altogether insignificant.... But, for the rest, full confidence ought to be placed in the information given by the *Acts of the Apostles* on the success of the Apostle, for its author does not suppress even Paul's failures or distressing events in the communities.

his own generation. He gives no indication that the conversion of the Jewish people was something that he expected to see realized within the lifetime of his contemporaries. We must, in forming our opinion of Paul's eschatological outlook, balance these indirect indications against those statements which may seem to predict an imminent coming.

But, as was pointed out in the beginning of this section, we could concede to the Form-critics a definite clear-cut expectation of the second coming within a generation or two and still require proof that this expectation induced mental abnormalities. In our own time modern war with its hazards and threats of destruction and death for cities within easy reach of enemy bombers fails to induce immediate pathological symptoms, if we may judge from statements released by psychologists and psychiatrists. Is there any more reason why the possibility of the Parousia should have left the early Christians incapable of leading normal lives while they waited, and of maintaining the sane objective historical viewpoint of their age and surroundings?

But the best proof that we are dealing with normal human beings, subject to the same failings and shortcomings as modern Christians, as ready to accept and be guided by the worldly, naturalistic viewpoint of the world around them as their twentieth century Catholic brethren, is to be found in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.

Far from having their whole attention fastened on the heavens from which Jesus was to appear again in majesty, we hear the Corinthian Christians admonished by Paul that if they must go to law with their brethren they should at least set up some sort of board of arbitration of their own; and with bitter irony he asks them whether they cannot find some one in the Church mean enough to decide these mean disputes.[23] Paul is not talking to simple folk hypnotized by the spell of imminent cataclysm, but to ordinary hardheaded Greek shopkeepers, who keep books and know their rights and are more than ready to go to court to sustain them.

In the same chapter Paul stingingly rebukes them for attempting to hide their disgraceful conduct behind sophisms. With the astuteness of their fathers they took refuge in the maxims "Naturalia non sunt turpia," "Esca ventri et venter escis," and,

[23] 1 Cor. 6:1-7.

as they would have it, "Corpus venereis et venerea corpori." These Christians no less than their fellow-townsmen had grown up in that atmosphere which made the term "korinthiazesthai" a byword for shame since the days of Aristophanes.

Still more significant in this letter is the difficulty about sacrificial meats, a difficulty which Paul handles with supernatural prudence. The Christians of that day like those of our own lived in a world that was predominantly pagan. And, like our present pagan world, its altogether natural standards were attractive; its customs pleasant; its associations, social and commercial, were both enticing and lucrative. So the Christian of the first century, as the Christian of the twentieth, had a recurring problem. To what extent could he keep up old friendships, maintain business relations, retain membership in associations which correspond to our Rotary and Kiwanis? And it need not surprise us that with Greek common sense and characteristic Greek subtlety he was ready to apply the principle of the Double Effect. In itself, eating food that had been sacrificed to idols (which the Corinthian Christian would certainly have to do when he met with a group of friends, as he often would, in the temple of some pagan diety) was an indifferent act, and the Corinthian neophyte thought his faith too strong to suffer from conversation with pagan friends and acquaintances. Thus, while many felt that buying sacrificial meats offered for sale in the butcher-shop or eating them in the homes of pagan friends and relatives was readily justifiable, the bolder maintained even that attendance at banquets held in connection with pagan sacrifices[24] need cause no uneasiness. And both groups thought their scrupulous fellow Christians too prim and precise. We need not follow Paul's answer which for its full development covers three chapters of this epistle,[25] but we must appreciate the mentality which we find depicted here,[26] the desire to temporize, to be fashionable, to

[24] These banquets could be either the natural complement of sacrifice, like the Communion in Christian liturgy, or, apart from that, might be free from any direct connection and consist mainly in eating within the temple area meat that had been sacrificed there. In the latter case the meat eaten would be that which would otherwise be offered for sale in the market place.

[25] 1 Cor. Chaps. 8–10.

[26] The various vices or faults which I catalogue here are not the moral disorders, the excesses in sexual indulgence, murder, orgies of license, which we associate with periods where life is uncertain because of wars

reconcile Christian profession with pagan customs and ways of thought, the readiness to despise as old-fashioned and intolerant the weaker brethren who would hamper our Christian liberty is as far from intelligible in any theory of eschatological tension as it is perfectly understandable to us today who give scarcely a thought to the possibility of the Parousia in the next thousand years. Paul's troubles would have been far fewer had he been dealing with simple Christians who prepared each morning for the return of Christ.

As a final instance of the same spirit among Paul's converts we may cite the abuses in connection with the Lord's supper. A meal that had begun as a symbol of fraternity and perfect equality had deteriorated into an abuse and scandal. Sobriety had given way to excess and drunkenness and, in place of unqualified mingling, groups and cliques bred an exclusiveness that doomed charity.[27] As a result, while some went hungry, the well-to-do ate and drank to excess. We can easily understand the abuse and we should not condemn too quickly these Corinthian Christians, but the spirit of "mine" and "thine" is hardly the spirit we look for in men and women who are dominated by the thought that "today or tomorrow will bring the consummation."[28] Dibelius is sure that concern about the future "is foreign to men who live in expectation of the end itself."[29] But people who refuse to share their good things with others who stand in need, and people who hail one another into court over trifles are people who have a very marked concern about the future.

Our study, then, of this aspect of early Christian life during the years in which the Gospel tradition crystallized shows us that if the first-generation Christian expected a return of Christ in the near future (an expectation which from Paul's attitude is very doubtful), he did not by any means let this influence his thought or action to the point that his ordinary attitude reveals any of that strain or tension which Form-critics discover in the

---

and plagues, but the "small" vices of people in a culture which they expect to see continue and in which they should like to live with security, be recognized in the right circles, and carry on business.

[27] 1 Cor. 11:17-34.

[28] Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (2d ed., Tübingen: Mohr, 1933), p. 9.

[29] Dibilius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (New York: Scribner, 1935), p. 13.

early communities. Unless, then, we find other reasons for disqualifying him, the Christian of that age is to be considered as objective in regard to past events and future contingencies as his non-Christian contemporary in the urban centers of the world of that day.

The second characteristic which Form-critics predicate of the early Church is that of loose and democratic structure. In an earlier article[30] it was pointed out that this quality is more tacitly presupposed than explicitly mentioned and proved. But it is an important presupposition, since only in uncontrolled and democratic (or one might better say unorganized) bodies could flourish those creative talents, which, according to Form-critics, acted upon the words and actions of Jesus to produce both standards of conduct for the *Urgemeinde* and our present Gospels. What, briefly, do the Great Epistles of St. Paul show us of the structure of Christian society?

To preserve some semblance of order in the various citations from the four Epistles, we may arrange the material bearing on this point under three heads. First, Paul's witness to the presence or absence of any stable hierarchical order; then, the source to which he attributes this arrangement; finally, some specific indications of the exercises of legislative, judicial, and executive power.

To know Paul is to realize that for him there must be in the Christian communities some hierarchical arrangement. Nothing is further from his thought than that Christians should be separate individuals brought into contact only through a common interest in Christ, mere fellow-travellers, loosely and precariously united by bonds that they can break at will. To Paul Christians are essentially members of a body, a stable organism. It is noteworthy that on each of the four occasions on which Paul catalogues the various "charismata" we find reference to the concept of Christians as a body. The catalogue in Rom. 12:6-8 is introduced by the declaration that "as in one body we have many members, but all the members have not the same office, so we being many are one body in Christ and every one of another." The two enumerations in First Corinthians are introduced by the difficulty of the "Pneumatics," and Paul intends to solve it

[30] "Form-critics, The Gospels, and St. Paul" in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, VI (1944), pp. 159-179, and particularly, pp. 172-174.

by showing that they are, after all, a part of that body which is Christ and, therefore, must subordinate themselves and their actions to the good of the whole organism. So, after enumerating[31] different kinds of gifts tending to the good of all, he recalls the favorite analogy, "For as the Body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body; so also is Christ." And he goes on for several verses to show the utter folly of one member despising the function and activity of other members, for he says[32] "if they were all one member, where would be the body?" And after developing this point a little more fully, Paul gives another catalogue of the various forms of gifts and ministries.[33] So, too, in Eph. 4:11, where another listing is made, it is introduced by the thought[34] "One body and one spirit . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and after the enumeration of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and doctors, Paul adds the reason for the distinction of gifts, namely "for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ."

The Christian, then, is in Paul's mind essentially a member of a stable organism, and in such an organism we should naturally expect to find certain persons enjoying fixed positions and exercising fixed ministries. At first sight, however, the presence of the charismatically gifted exercising functions flowing from special gifts may seem to have excluded fixed positions and ministry, to have made the management of the early communities difficult, and to have injected an element of irresponsibility. For we would surmise that the charismata as transitory gifts[35] would be offered and withdrawn at will, given now to one, now to another. We could hardly blame critics for refusing to put much con-

[31] 1 Cor. 12:12. For Father de Grandmaison's argument that the first Christians were not a "simple association of free believers aiming in the same direction," see his *Jesus Christ*, III, Book VI, Chapter I, "The Religion of Jesus Christ in the middle of the First Century," pp. 427-430.

[32] 1 Cor. 12:19.

[33] 1 Cor. 12:28-31.

[34] Eph. 4:4,5.

[35] Prat, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 128-129, defines them as "gratuitous supernatural and transitory gifts conferred for the sake of the general good and for the edification of the mystical body of Christ." By "gratuitous" here Father Prat understands that the charismata had no "necessary connection with sanctifying grace and that, not being requisite for salvation, the Holy Spirit gives them to whom He will and when He will.

fidence in communities where those who exercised the functions of hands yesterday were the head today and would be the feet tomorrow.

Against this difficulty it may be urged that the very abuse that Paul is trying to settle in chapters 12–14 of First Corinthians arises precisely from the fact that certain persons habitually received gifts which tended to their personal advantage as well as to the common good and tended also to make them despise those not so favored. There would have been less trouble at Corinth had the Spirit granted His gifts at random, so that those who yesterday were passed by, today were filled with the Spirit.[36]

The real difficulty is rather to determine whether the ultimate authority in the communities was vested in those who regularly possessed special transitory gifts of the Spirit, and vested in them just because they possessed these gifts, or whether the final decision rested with those who claimed and were acknowledged to have a more objective or at least a more clearly discernible and permanent title, a divine appointment to rule.[37] And in this discussion it will not do to establish merely that some or even many of those who directed the communities had de facto charismatic gifts either of the more or of the less striking kind, but it must be established that the right to govern was based directly on the possession of these graces, before any one can assert that the communities were controlled by the charismatics.

Pierre Batiffol[38] has formulated the answer we would give to

[36] Prat, *op. cit.*, I, p. 129, explaining the term "transitory," which he uses in his definition of charismata, says that these gifts are transitory "in comparison with the theological virtues, which are lasting, above all with Charity, which never falls away; yet it possesses a certain stability in virtue of which a man habitually endowed with the gift of prophecy is called a prophet."

[37] To avoid confusion it should be noted that not all the charismata mentioned are of the exotic character which we today are likely to associate with that term and some of them are special graces for every-day functions within the communities. Father Allo (*Épître Première aux Corinthiens*, Excursus XIII, pp. 338-339) insists on the double series of supernatural activities, the one extraordinary and de jure transitory, the other presupposing permanent position, which requires rather the "grace of state" than extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit.

[38] *L'Église Naissante et La Catholicisme* (Neuvième Édition; Paris: Gabalda, 1927), p. 180. The translation is taken from *Primitive Catholicism*, the translation made (from the fifth edition of the French work) by Henri L. Brianceau (New York: Longmans, 1911).

this difficulty when he asked Renan, who in his *Marc Aurèle* had recognized the powerlessness of individual inspiration to spawn anything save anarchy:

> Was it really only when the work of Jesus was jeopardized through the outpouring and contagious spread of charisms, that discipline arose to save His work? To unruly charisms, Renan opposes in each community the ancients or presbyters; but if their office did not come to these ancients and presbyters in virtue of some higher privilege, whence and how did they get the power they exercised over the charisms themselves? Order could never have issued out of charismatic anarchy, had not some authority existed previously to the outpouring of the charisms—an authority which can only be that of the apostolate, continuing the authority of the Master.
>
> To say that every permanent ecclesiastical function is a charism which fixed and imposed itself, seems a mere conjecture as gratuitous as it is improbable; for the earliest permanent ecclesiastical function which history records is that of presbyters and of ancients—to which no charism corresponds—and the same remark can be made of the *episcopi* and the deacons. The traditional view which derives episcopacy, not from any transformation of unknown charisms, but from the powers of the apostolate, is much more plausible; and accounts far more easily for the fact that in all Christian communities episcopacy was set on the same foundations.

Admitting that the government, as the organization, of the infant Church was still rudimentary,[39] that among those who ruled the Church were probably found many of the more privileged "charismatiques," and that Paul's enumerations, in which ordinary and extraordinary charismatic gifts are mingled without explanation, leaves something to be desired, it is, nonetheless, clear in the Pauline Epistles that there is a recognized stable authority, directing various and subordinate ministries, and quite capable of passing judgment on the pneumatics themselves. For in the discussions of chapters 12–14 of the First Epistle to the Corinthians Paul shows no more hesitation in laying down rules for the exercise of charismatic gifts than he does in legislating about the place of women in church, for virgins and married folk, for the use of sacrificial meats, or for the celebration of the Eucharist. One almost holds one's breath at the apostolic rashness with which Paul regulates the outpouring of the Spirit in the last part of the fourteenth chapter. It is more than apparent that Paul expects that what he binds on earth will be bound also in heaven. And he expects that, if he decides that when two or

[39] Prat, *op. cit.*, II. 372-373.

three have spoken in tongues in the presence of an interpreter that is enough for one assembly, then the Holy Ghost will inhibit His special action to the limits determined by one whom He has appointed to govern the Church upon earth. What the Spirit may breathe in private for the sanctification of the individual is no particular concern of Paul's, but Paul is sure of one thing, and it is this, that there is a higher law for the corporate body than individual inspiration, and that he administers that higher law.

But what is the source of that power in Paul, whence those arms "mighty to God unto the pulling down of fortifications, detroying counsels, and every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ: and having in readiness to revenge all disobedience"?[40] The source of his power is his apostolic vocation, the "Apostolatus ad obediendum fidei in omnibus gentibus."[41] And the Apostolate which Paul possesses is "non ab hominibus, neque per hominem, sed per Jesum Christum ad Deum Patrem."[42] And, though in the Pauline writings the term "Apostle" can have two or more related but not identical senses,[43] Paul's insistence is on his right to the title in the full sense in which it is borne by those whom he too acknowledges as οἱ δοκοῦντες.[44] This insistence cannot be missed in the opening chapters of Galatians, in much of Second Corinthians, and in the energetic comparison of the ninth chapter of First Corinthians. As Batiffol points out, though Paul does not always use the word in its fullest sense, it is clear how he understands it of himself, especially from his very precise use of it in the salutation to the Epistles, where it is ever the implicit title to respect and obedience:

> ... the word apostle, whilst still remaining a common name, gradually tends toward its historical meaning, through the expression "apostle of Jesus Christ," an expression of which St. Paul is fond. It is the title with which he accompanies his name at the beginning of most of his Epistles: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, called by the will of God" (1 Cor. 1:1); "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus,

[40] 2 Cor. 10:4-6. [41] Rom. 1:5. [42] Gal. 1:1.

[43] For a treatment of the various significations of the term Apostle one may see Batiffol's discussion in the second chapter of *L'Église Naissante et la Catholicisme*. Fr. A. C. Cotter, S.J., in his *Theologia Fundamentalis* (Worcester: Heffernan, 1940), p. 371, has a clear summary presentation of the various senses of the word. [44] Gal. 2:2; 2:6(bis).

by the will of God" (2 Cor. 1:1; Eph. 1:1). So, too, in the Pastoral Epistles. On the other hand, when Paul places in the subscription of some epistle, together with his own name, the names of some of his co-workers, he is careful not to give them a title which is not theirs. He writes at the beginning of the Epistle to the Philippians: "Paul and Timothy, the servants of Christ Jesus" (Phil. 1:1); to the Colossians: "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus, by the will of God, and Timothy [his] brother" (Col. 1:1); to the Thessalonians: "Paul and Sylvanus and Timothy" only (1 and 2 Thess. 1:1); to the Corinthians: "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus, by the will of God, and Timothy [his] brother" (2 Cor. 1:1). Unlike the appellation "servant of Christ," the appellation "apostle of Christ" does not signify a moral quality, but an exceptional mission.[45]

Paul's concept, then, of the Church is that of a stable body, hierarchically organized, under the supreme direction of the Apostles, whose position is due not to superior charismatic distinctions, but to the fact that they have seen the Lord,[46] have been commissioned by the Lord,[47] whose credentials are found in the very person of those whom they have won to Christ.[48] They are what they are, because by the grace of God they have been made wise architects,[49] ministers of Christ and dispensers of His mysteries,[50] because they are ministers of the New Testament comparable to Moses of the Old.[51]

In closing this section, let us note some instances[52] of Paul's exercise of legislative and executive power. In the Epistle to the

[45] *Primitive Catholicism*, p. 40.
[46] 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:8,9.
[47] Rom. 1:1-5; 1 Cor. 1:17; 9:16-18; 2 Cor. 5:20; Gal. 1:1; 2:7.
[48] 2 Cor. 3:1; 9:1.
[49] 1 Cor. 3:10.
[50] 1 Cor. 4:1.
[51] 2 Cor. 3:6-18.
[52] It would be interesting to consider separately the spirit in which St. Paul exercised his authority. If we are not careful we may at times mistake his frequent forbearance, his appeals and supplications to his wayward Christians as so many arguments against his consciousness of his apostolic authority. We who have been inured to the accounts of the despotic methods of totalitarian regimes may forget that Paul was always keenly aware that authority in Christ's kingdom is unto life and not unto death, so that only as a last resort would he come with the rod of Apostolic rigor. Almost at the end of 2 Cor. (12:19), a letter very largely dedicated to a defense of his ministry, Paul warns his faithful that they must not misunderstand this long apology of his. It is not made to them as judges of his actions, but before God who alone can judge him "in Christ"; so far as they his beloved children are concerned, it is made for their good, their "edification."

Romans it is not surprising that we find only general moral direction in the closing chapters, for Paul did not found that Church. It is in the two letters to the Corinthians that Paul stands before us constantly in the fullness of apostolic power. In the first letter we see him regulating married life by setting limits to the practice of continence by married persons,[53] promulgating the Pauline Privilege,[54] determining to what extent the Christians can partake of meats offered to idols,[55] insisting that women appear in church with their heads veiled,[56] regulating the observance of the Lord's supper,[57] setting down the limits for the manifestation of the charismatic gifts in the assembly of the faithful.[58]

In the case of the incestuous man at Corinth, we observe Paul administering the lex penalis. The Corinthians appear to have temporized in this instance, and Paul, first, blames them for their laxity in tolerating such a crime to the scandal even of pagans. Then, in what Fr. Allo calls the "first clearcut example of the exercise of a lex penalis in the Church,"[59] Paul passes sentence of excommunication upon the unhappy sinner. And he orders that the Christians at Corinth assemble and solemnly pronounce the excommunication which he had already determined upon and declared.[60]

That Paul has power to coerce and penalize by spiritual punishments is clear from several passages in the closing chapters of Second Corinthians; where the apostolic powers are vindicated in words that are thunder and lightning. He begs the Corinthians[61] not to force him to that boldness in their presence which it has been charged he shows only when he is far away. And let them not think that, because he does not war according to the flesh, he cannot war according to the spirit. For the warfare of the spirit he is armed with weapons of divine might that can

[53] 1 Cor. 7:4-6.
[54] 1 Cor. 7:12-16.
[55] 1 Cor. Chaps. 8 and 10.
[56] 1 Cor. 11:3-16.
[57] 1 Cor. 11:33-34.
[58] 1 Cor. 14:22-40.
[59] E. Allo, *Première Épître aux Corinthiens*, p. 117.
[60] Despite a multiplicity of renderings of this passage (which can be found discussed and compared in Allo, *op. cit.*, p. 121, the power which St. Paul asserts for himself in this passage cannot be challenged by any rendering of the text.
[61] 2 Cor. 10:2.

pull down fortifications and reduce every height and tower, weapons with which to punish every disobedience.[62] So far he has been among them as a father, and that he wishes to be always and to all of them, but he warns them solemnly that the next time he comes, if the abuses have not been corrected, then "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word stand."[63] In other words Paul assures them that this time there will be a formal judicial hearing and upon those convicted there will be passed a severe and unhesitating sentence. For he has warned them before and he warns them again that, if he comes, he will not spare them. He entreats them not to force him to show his hand, not to make trial of those powers which he has for their good rather than for their destruction.

The brief study we have made of the structure of the Christian communities as we find them in St. Paul leads us to discover in them a solidarity which finds apt illustration in the solidarity between the members of the human body. In this closely-knit organism, direction and authority is lodged ultimately in Apostles, whose pre-eminence rests upon their call by Jesus Christ and not upon charismatic favors. This power, though regulated by charity and exercised with paternal consideration, has all the functions associated with authority in a perfectly constituted society and is enforced by suitable sanctions, including excommunication.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Ind.

[62] 2 Cor. 10:4-7.

[63] 2 Cor. 13:1. This interpretation, while of good standing, goes against one that has found supporters from Chrysostom to Bousset, Lietzmann, Plummer, Toussaint, Bachmann, and Windisch. These take the two or three witnesses to refer to Paul's two or three visits of Corinth, which Paul is supposed to personify here and to call witnesses against them. Allo is, I think, correct in saying (*Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens*, p. 335) that this interpretation is "too subtle and roundabout." "No objection can be raised against the intention which Paul declares of investigating the case of public sinners according to the due process of law, since a judicial power had been constituted in the Church and this was indeed the time to employ it." Fr. Cornely (in the commentary on this Epistle in the *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, p. 343) agrees with Fr. Allo, "Praeprimis enim ne levissima quidem ratio adest cur sensus proprius, qui planus est et apertus, relinquatur, ut metaphora inusitatissima admittatur."

SHEOL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Rev. Clement J. McNaspy, S.J., M.A.

A rather popular charge against the Old Testament is that it says nothing of the future life. At this the devout Renan was scandalized, and his disciples continue to share his scruples. Today, it is true, many rationalists have swung about face, holding that the Jews were so obsessed with the life after death that in fact their early religion was largely ancestor worship. It should be of some value, then, to examine the Bible texts on this one phase of the after-life, to see how their teaching on Sheol fits into Catholic truth.

The treatment of Sheol offers, too, a tangible instance of the more general question of development of dogma, one of the more talked of problems in present day theology. While it is relatively easy to see the line along which dogma has progressed in the New Dispensation, it is easy to forget that in the Old there were considerable additions made from time to time. There is always the temptation to treat the Old Testament exactly as we do the New, even to the point of trying to dig out precise dogmatic statements where actually there are only vague foreshadowings. Hence, it may prove useful to watch a key-dogma of the New Testament slowly take shape in the Old.

Our procedure will be to examine the important texts that deal either explicitly or implicitly with Sheol. The order will be roughly chronological. After this survey, we shall try to draw conclusions by way of summary.

First, a provisional description of Sheol. Its very etymology (like almost everything else about it) is still debated. Some trace it to the root שׁעל meaning "to dig," and suggesting an underground cavern, like the English word "hell" related to "hollow." Another root, שׁאל has also been proposed, meaning "to ask," and implying the demanding, insatiable devourer of men, or possibly the questioning of the dead, or divination. In any case, we shall see that Sheol does not mean "hell" in the precise Christian sense. The Septuagint translated it with the word "Hades" a rendering that comes closer to the original than our Vulgate term "infernus" with its Christian connotation. We could, perhaps, use the non-committal term "underworld," but even this has a sinister color not found in the simple word "Sheol."

The early historical books, the Pentateuch, Judges, and Kings, treat Sheol obscurely and only in passing. This is as should be expected. It is evident that unaided reason has little to say about the next life; besides, the Hebrews were not noted for speculative prowess, at least not until their contact with Greek thought. Hence, what little we find on Sheol must be either a vestige of primitive revelation, the result of a new revelation, or the residue of certain ancient Semitic beliefs of doubtful origin. Without exaggerating the this-worldliness of the early Hebrews, we must admit that they were certainly preoccupied with the present life. They thought of their responsibilities before Yahweh in terms of reward or punishment in this life. "Quia Deus est et Remunerator sit," they did believe; but this remuneration was to be mainly by way of financial or political success before death. This point is generally admitted.

But what about retribution in the after-life? In these early books there is no sharp distinction made between the lot of just or unjust in Sheol. In a general sort of way it is hinted that those favored by God in the present life will continue to enjoy various prerogatives and distinctions in the underworld. David exhorts Solomon not to let Joab go to Sheol in peace, and to send Shimei there in blood, according to their deserts (3 Kgs. 2:5-9). This suggests that the wicked will continue their unhappy status in Sheol. Further, in these books the Messias is already mentioned and personal responsibility indicated, both dogmas bearing some relation to Sheol.

Unbelievers have asserted that Sheol means no more than the grave. True, the fact that the Semites buried their dead in the earth may have helped cause the general belief that the abode of the dead was somewhere in the earth. But it would be unkind to think the Hebrews so naive as to confuse these two ideas. Knowing full well that buried corpses were mouldering in the grave, they realized that some part of the human composite continued to live. God repeatedly refers to Himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; He would hardly have styled Himself so if these revered patriarchs were altogether dead. You recall the episode of Joseph and his envious brothers. They told Jacob that a wild beast had devoured his son Joseph. He believed them, yet he was sure that Joseph's soul was somewhere else. For he grieves: "I will go down to Sheol to my son, mourning"

(Gen. 37:35). Such a statement would be absurd if Sheol meant merely the physical grave; for Joseph's only grave at that time was the beast's stomach, at least so Jacob thought. Finally, the common figure for "death," namely, "to be gathered to one's fathers," indicates, if it does not prove peremptorily, that Sheol is not the grave; for it is used to describe death even before one is buried, or when one is not interred in the ancestral tomb at all.

We may next look at the didactic books: Job, Psalms, and Ecclesiastes. One reason why the book of Job has been named the "World's Classic" may be its insistence on that eternal, most deeply human problem: the apparent triumph of the wicked over the good. Job is compelled to call attention to life after death, though Sheol is still a gloomy place, where the dead are feeble, voiceless, and without knowledge. It is "the land of darkness and the shadow of death.... where there is no order, and light is as darkness (10:21-22). Yet God is there, for "Sheol is naked before him, and Abaddon (a synonym for Sheol) hath no covering (from him)" (26:6).

The Psalms too are in general quite cheerless on the subject. "I am counted among them that go down into the pit (Sheol); I am become as a man without help," bemoans the Psalmist.

"Like the slain that lie in the grave thou rememberest no more, for they are cut off from thy hand" (Ps. 87:5-6). "For in death there is no remembrance of Thee; in Sheol who shall give Thee thanks?" (Ps. 6:6), and other texts have often been cited to prove that God has no concern or control over the souls there. We must grant a measure of obscurity in these and parallel passages, where, for the sake of emphasis or vivid contrast, the sacred poet appears to contradict what he elsewhere affirmed. Here one invokes the general principle of exegesis, namely, that what is obscure be interpreted in the light of what is clear. Now, there are many clear passages in the Psalms which strikingly state God's control of Sheol. For example, "if I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there" (138:8). Moreover, we have to keep in mind that in the verses just quoted the Psalmist is concerned more with God's public worship, so important to all pious Israelites—which worship will obviously cease with death. There are also texts, even in earlier books of the Bible, where God's interest in the departed souls is plain. Take, for instance, the passage where Saul persuades the witch of Endor to bring the

prophet Samuel back from Sheol to prophesy for him (1 Kgs. 28:7-25). Now the gift of prophecy was never conceived of apart from divine help or afflatus; yet Samuel, coming up from Sheol, has no difficulty prophesying as he had done in life, clearly again with God's special assistance. Finally, as reliable commentators admit, one reason for the dread of death so apparent in writings of this and other periods of the Old Testament, is that very little seems to have been revealed of the true state of the departed.

Yet the Psalms, however rudimentary in their portrayal of the after-life, have on this subject a distinct contribution to the development of dogma. Here we find accentuated the difference between the lot of the just and the unjust in the life beyond the grave. For the unjust "are set towards Sheol like a flock, death is their shepherd, and the just shall dominate over them.... But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol, for He will take me away" (48:15-16). Here, as elsewhere (15:10), the resurrection of the body is foretold, a doctrine that will undergo considerable development, and which is closely connected with the belief in Sheol.

There is, too, the inspiring passage from Ps. 72:25-27: "Whom else have I in heaven? And upon earth I have no delight outside Thee. When my flesh and my heart are wasted away, then my protection and my possession will be God for eternity. For behold! only those at a distance from Thee perish, thou dost destroy only those who fall away from Thee." And here and there we observe other traces of what seems the promise of blessedness in Heaven, as in these expressive words: "the upright shall see His face" (Ps. 10:8).

Ecclesiastes, for all his wisdom, is quite dismal about the status of man after death. "A living dog is better than a dead lion,... for the living know that they die; but the dead know not anything.... There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol whither thou goest" (9:4-5,10). This hardly suggests a brighter picture of the other world than that of the Odyssey. Odysseus visited Hades, where he held a number of interesting conversations with former companions-in-arms. He finds Achilles in pretty low spirits (no passing wrath, this time), and tries to cheer him up a bit. But Achilles straightway made answer and said: "Nay, seek not to speak soothingly to one of death, glorious Odysseus. I should choose, in order to live on

earth, to serve as the hireling of another, of some portionless man whose livelihood was but small, rather than to be lord over all the dead that have perished (Od. 11: 488-491). We are repeatedly reminded of the Greek attitude toward Hades not only in Ecclesiastes, but even in the more "spiritual" books of the Old Testament. Ecclesiastes is particularly down-to-earth, even for a Jew, in his outlook on life, advocating a moderate enjoyment of all good things, yet reminding us that "all is vanity." But as we read along in the book we become increasingly aware that divine retribution is ahead. Death is called the return of the spirit "unto the God who gave it." And "God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or evil" (12:14). This reminder that God will have the last word suggests the doctrine of retribution after death.

In reviewing the prophets it will be impossible here to treat them individually. Ezechiel contains several strong, moving verses on Sheol (32:18ff.), but Isaias seems particularly explicit and graphic. In his satire on the King of Babylon he describes Sheol as personified and rousing the dead kings seated in lugubrious splendor: "Sheol is in the commotion over you, at meeting you upon your entrance. On your account it is arousing the shades, all the mighty ones of the earth. It causes to rise from their thrones all the kings of the nations." The King of Babylon, being a particularly bad man, is taunted by the inmates of Sheol, who still have enough life in them to sneer: "You have become weak like ourselves, you have become like us.... You were brought down to Sheol, to the bottom of the pit." And anticipating Dr. Faustus's outburst in an opposite sense, they ask: "Is this the man who shook the earth, caused kingdoms to totter?" (14:16ff.).

In Isaias there occurs, too, the well-known psalm of Ezechias, in which it is somewhat hard to distinguish the king's personal sentiments from the inspired words of the prophet. He bemoans that he must go to the gates of Sheol. "I said, I shall not see the Lord, the Lord, in the land of the living; I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world.... For Sheol cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; those that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth" (32:11ff.). The mournful character of life after death, at least what Ezechias thought to be life after death, could hardly have been more poignantly expressed.

Lastly, we shall examine the notion of Sheol as presented in the later, or Deuterocanonical, books. Here, as was to be expected, we find revelation in a comparatively advanced state. Ecclesiasticus says that the just man is blessed by God on the day of his death (1:13). This in spite of the fact that Ecclesiasticus is concerned with practical wisdom for this life rather than with a complete treatment of human destiny. The Second Book of Machabees narrates the torments of the seven holy brothers and their consolation in the thought of eternal life to follow (7:1ff.). The venerable Eleazar, called upon to deny God or face the consequences, "answered without delay, according to the ordinances of the holy law made by God, that he would rather be sent into the other world "... for though, for the present time I should be delivered from the punishments of men, yet should I not escape the hand of the Almighty neither alive or dead (2 Mach. 6:23-26). Further, we are all familiar with the text so often used in sermons on Purgatory, about praying for the dead "that they may be loosed from their sins." This obviously represents a great stride in the development of Old Testament dogma on the after-life.

Finally, in the Book of Wisdom we read a rather full teaching on the subject. "The souls of the just are in the hands of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them." The sacred writer admits that the just will seem to die and meet destruction, yet "they are in peace.... Afflicted in few things, in many they shall be well rewarded: because God has tried them, and found them worthy of himself" (3:1-5). And another quotation: "Such things as these the sinners said in hell: For the hope of the wicked is as dust which is blown away with the wind .... but the just shall live for evermore: and their reward is with the Lord" (5:14-16).

From this brief historical sketch we may gather that the Old Testament does not offer a fully developed treatise *De Novissimis*. Perhaps a misunderstood idea of biblical inspiration had led us to expect rather complete ideas on the after-life.

Granted this, what are the features of Sheol as presented in the old Testament books? Again and again Sheol is pictured as a land of darkness and dust, of shadow rather than substance. It is called the pit (Ez. 26:20), far below the earth (Ps. 62:10). There is the greatest possible distance between it and heaven

(Am. 9:10), as is later illustrated in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Again it is described as a city with gates (Ps. 117:18), and at another time, Sheol is personified as an all-devouring monster (Isa. 5:14; Prov. 27:20). It lays snares for men and lies in wait to trap them (Ps. 17:6). Thus we cannot hold that there is a single, consistent picture of Sheol. Different aspects are proposed, some metaphorical, some hyperbolic, but which no writer takes the pains to integrate into theses and syllogisms. It may be said in general that the pre-exilic view of Sheol was rather dreary, later taking on a more hopeful tone.

The condition of the souls there is also variously described. The passage just seen, where Isaias pictures the fall of the king of Babylon into Sheol, shows at least some self-awareness and the very human trait of criticizing one's fellow men. The souls in Sheol seem to retain interest in their families on earth; at least, such may be the interpretation of Jeremias's famed passage about Rachel mourning her children (31:15), which St. Matthew later applies to the grieving mothers of the Holy Innocents. In fact, this interest and even contact between the living and the dead have been so stressed by liberal exegetes as to be made the basis for a new attack on Old Testament religion: it is said to have grown out of ancestor worship.

A verse commonly quoted in proof of this opinion is taken from Isaias: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek you them that have returning and knowing spirits, that chirp and mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?" (8:19). The verse, undoubtedly, shows that among the Jews of Isaias's time there was a tendency toward necromancy, or consultation of the dead—dead ancestors in particular. But this no more proves that Hebrew religion grew out of a primitive necromancy than the modern fad for spiritualism proves that twentieth century spiritualism has grown out of Christianity. Yet there is a tendency, on the part of the people, observable here and there in the Old Testament, toward this form of wizardry and superstition. The strenuous effort of prophets and legislators to combat this leaning is proof of its existence.

There is no hint in all their attacks on spiritualism that it is impossible; it is so possible, in fact, that it is dangerous. Whether or not these ancient ghosts came at the beck and call of

spiritualistic mediums or witches, there is on record only the instance of the prophet Samuel returning from Sheol to prophecy. This is, obviously, a far cry from necromancy as generally understood. Superstitions were rather a rival than a source of religion. There is no suggestion of a cult given to the dead. In fact, it has been argued, and quite convincingly (though there is no space to repeat the arguments here), that necromancy was never a basic feature of Semitic religions, Babylonian or otherwise. It seems quite likely, on the other hand, that some sort of Sheol teaching goes back to the common stock of Semitic beliefs, older even than the divine call and revelation given to Abraham. These teachings were added to and more sharply defined by subsequent revelations, as we have seen.

In this article many aspects of this problem of Sheol have been untouched, others only hinted at. Just why God chose to leave His people in comparative ignorance of the future life may perhaps never be perfectly clear to us. Possibly it was because so worldly-minded a race could be impressed only by the thought of palpable rewards and punishments on this earth. Perhaps it was because, for the time being, there was very little to be offered in the other world, so long as heaven was closed. Perhaps it was precisely in order to leave the great ultimate truths of eternal life to be revealed personally by Him who is the Life—to know whom is eternal life.

St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

THE REAL HEART OF ST. PAUL

Rev. Werner Hannan, O.F.M.Cap.

Sholem Asch's latest book, *The Apostle,* is currently elbowing its way up to the top of the best-seller lists. Deft and dramatic, it is jammed with graphic writing. Its scholarship, in places, strikes deep. On the debit side, however, we must call in the mourners. More than once running afoul of theological truth, the author also sends up a divot when speaking of St. Paul's emotional nature. The Apostle comes off the Asch press lacking that "soft, winning goodness, that graciousness of speech, that warmth which characterized his fellow apostle, Peter." Asch repeatedly speaks of Paul's "bitterness (and) bursts of anger," "his bitterness and resentment," "his bitterness and hostility." Such a picture can hardly square with the Paul of history. For the Apostle of the Gentiles had a heart as big as his apostolate; and, Sholem Asch notwithstanding, as warm as it was big. To the faithful, to those who attacked him personally, and to the early Christians who would retain Jewish practices, Paul's heart was a heart of tender love.

If there is one theme running through all St. Paul's letters, it is this: he is in love with Christ and with Christianity. Let the blows fall where they may, Paul has gone all-out for the cause of the Word-Incarnate. Even *The Apostle* admits this much. Before conversion, his ardent soul had been steeped in hate. He scoured Palestine like a hungry bloodhound, sniffing windward and leeward for any scent of the evil Christians. Once they had felt his bite, they were done to death in a hurry. In the very act of going to Damascus for more Christian game, he trembled under the fiery breath of Christ: "Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute me?" His hour had come: the hater became the lover. And the heart of that lover stands wide open to humanity's gaze in all his letters.

St. Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians is a classic of paternal affection. The faithful at Thessalonica were still tender babes in the faith, wavering between the lush and loose morals of the old man, and the chaste confinement of their new-found faith. In spite of calumnies and persecutions, they had remained loyal to Paul and to the Faith. So, the Apostle, his heart aglow, took up his pen and turned to them. He began with a hymn of thanksgiving for the faith of his neophytes, then explained why

he had come to them. Fully conscious of his divine authority, Paul could have commanded the attention of all. Yet he commands or demands nothing unreasonable. Instead of asking wages for the work of his ministry, he labored on the side, making tents. Never would he be a bother to his flock. He became a father to all so as to multiply his spiritual children.

> Although, as the apostles of Christ, we could have claimed a position of honor among you, still, while in your midst, we were as children: as if a nurse were cherishing her own children, so we in our love for you would gladly have imparted to you not only the gospel of God, but also our own souls; because you had become most dear to us.
>
> For you remember, brethren, our labor and toil. We worked night and day so as not to be a burden to any of you while we preached to you the gospel of God. You are witnesses and God, also, how holy and blameless was our conduct towards you who have believed; inasmuch as you are aware of how we entreated and comforted each one of you, acting towards you as a father towards his children, declaring to you that you should walk worthily of God, who called you into his kingdom and glory (1 Thess. 2:7-12).

The Apostle employs the same figure in Second Corinthians (6:11-13): "We are frank with you, O Corinthians; our heart is wide open to you. In us there is no lack of room for you, but in your heart there is no room for us. Now, as having a recompense in like kind—I speak as to my children—be you also open wide to us." Again in Galatians (4:19) Paul speaks of "my dear children, with whom I am in labor again, until Christ is formed in you!"

Paul was writing to the Thessalonians only a short time after he had left their city. The events spoken of are still fresh. Only too well did the Apostle realize the peril of his neophytes. They had foresworn their pagan ways, and yet that same pagan environment surrounded them. A much-frequented port, Thessalonica opened her gates to the flotsam and jetsam of humanity. Lust and avarice ran neck-and-neck in the hearts of many Thessalonians. Such an overwhelmingly Gentile city made short shrift of those who tried to bridle instincts which seemed so natural. Paul knew all this. That is why his heart bled to return to his charges and give the spur to their courage.

> But we, brethren, being bereaved of you for a short time, in sight, not in heart, have made more than ordinary efforts to hasten to see you, so great has been our desire. For we wanted to come to you—I, Paul, more than once—but Satan hindered us. For what is our hope,

or joy, or crown or glory, if not you before our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? Yes, you are our glory and joy (1 Thess. 2:17-20).

Paul lived these days with his young converts ever in mind. Their sad plight touched him deeply; so deeply, in fact, that he resolved to send Timothy to them. Completely forgetful of self, Paul realized that when the flesh and the spirit came to grips in Thessalonica, all but the most fervent souls would be hard put to keep from yielding to the flesh.

And so when we could bear it no longer we decided to remain at Athens alone, and we sent Timothy, our brother and a servant of God in the gospel of Christ, to strengthen and comfort you in your faith, lest any should be shaken by these tribulations. For you yourselves know that we are appointed thereto. Indeed, even when we were with you, we used to tell you that we should suffer tribulations, so also it has come to pass, and you know. Consequently, when I could bear it no longer, I sent in order to know your faith, lest perhaps the tempter might have tempted you, and our labor might come to naught (1 Thess. 3:1-5).

When Timothy reported back to Paul, the Apostle must have dropped to his knees in an ecstasy of joy. For he learned—not that they had remained faithful to a man, or that sin was a thing of the past—but he learned that, in the main, faith and charity were climbing day by day. This knowledge of their fidelity did not quiet the longing in Paul's heart. Before, he yearned to see them to strengthen their faith; now, he yearns to see them to rejoice in their faithfulness.

But now that Timothy has come to us from you, and has made known to us your faith and charity, and your kindly remembrance of us at all times, and that you long to see us just as we long to see you, brethren, amid all our trials and tribulations, on account of your faith; because now we live (i.e., really enjoy life), if you stand fast in the Lord. For what thanks can we return to God for you for all the joy wherewith we rejoice for your sakes before our God? Night and day we pray more and more that we may see you again, and may supply those things that are lacking to your faith (1 Thess. 3:6-10).

Paul's desire to love and to be loved shine through many passages in his letter to the Philippians. In 1:25-26 he writes: "And with this conviction (i.e., he longs to be dissolved and to be with Christ, but his presence here on earth is necessary for the sake of his converts) I know that I shall stay on and continue with you all for your progress and joy in the faith, that your rejoicing in my regard may abound in Christ Jesus through my

coming to you again." Later in the same epistle, he continues: "I have rejoiced in the Lord greatly that now at last your concern for me has revived. Indeed, you were always concerned, but lacked opportunity" (4:10). The knowledge that his charges have a spot in their hearts for him alone gives him courage and confidence.

That he himself returned this love needs precious little explanation. In the same letter to the Philippians (1:7-8) the Apostle writes: "... because I have you in my heart, all of you, alike in my chains and in the defense and confirmation of the gospel, as sharers in my joy. For God is my witness how I long for you all in the heart of Christ Jesus." In Second Corinthians (2:4) Paul strikes the same chord: "For I wrote to you in much affliction and anguish of heart, with many tears, not that you might be grieved, but that you might know the great love I have for you." He reveals his love for Timothy in one of the most personal passages he ever wrote: "Recalling thy tears, I long to see thee, that I may be filled with joy. I remember that unfeigned faith of thine, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois and in thy mother Eunice, and dwells, I am certain, in thee also" (2 Tim. 1:4-5).

The Apostle remained celibate all his life. We can look, then, for the sublimation of the yearnings of his rich and emotional nature in his burning love for Christ and His Church. It was this same love which penetrated beyond the shell of sin to view the core of goodness within the heart of man. For the Apostle, in his own greatness of heart, knew that if you dig down deep enough into a man, you will find treasures undreamt-of on the surface. And if anyone who has breathed this planet's air and trodden its paths knew the human heart, that man was Paul of Tarsus.

His early life had paved the way for the work of later years. He lived in surroundings which presented man at his best and at his worst. From his pious mother and father he learned the Scriptures; for his pharisaical knowledge he sat at the feet of the learned Gamaliel in Jerusalem. His birthplace at Tarsus in Cilicia was a far-famed shipping center. A sort of pre-war Shanghai, it opened its arms to all manner of men. Paul thus became acquainted with practically every type of humanity. In immediate contact with Roman, Greek and Jewish culture, he was admirably fitted to become the Apostle of the Gentiles.

But his apostolate was not always a land of milk and honey. Abuses inevitably cropped up; and Paul, as a dutiful father, had to root them out. Nor can one fabricate any kind of conflict between Paul's tenderness of heart and his zeal for the house of God. For true love must hate evil. Christ Himself, a shining model of love and tenderness, had to resort to whipcords against the money-changers in the temple. In like manner, Paul had to correct the congregation at Corinth for the factions that had sprung up there. But his tone is the tone of gentleness. Lest an unkind word creep in, he reassures them:

> I write these things not to put you to shame, but to admonish you as my dearest children. For although you have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet you have not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus, through the gospel, did I beget you (1 Cor. 4:14-15).

In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul had to correct his erring flock, and set them back on the way to God. His words, written more with his heart's blood than with ink, struck the Corinthians hard. Smitten with sorrow, they had turned from their evil ways with genuine repentance. Paul's heart must have swelled with joy when he wrote:

> ...now I am glad; not because you were made sorry, but because your sorrow led you to repentance (2 Cor. 7:9).
>
> If then I did write to you, it was not for the sake of him who did the wrong, nor for the sake of him who suffered the wrong; but to make clear the zeal we have for you, before God. This is why we have been comforted (2 Cor. 7:12-13).

Occasionally Paul had to warn his charges against a sinner in their community. But he feared that his words might make the sinner an outcast from his brethren. After his warning, then, the Apostle writes as tenderly as a father: "Yet do not regard him as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother" (2 Thess. 3:15).

Likewise in Corinth, a man had committed a crime. He had been publicly reprimanded; and Paul feared that an overdose of punishment might do more harm than good. In the spirit of Christ, his Master, he writes: "...you should rather forgive and comfort him (the sinner), lest perchance he be overwhelmed by too much sorrow. Therefore I exhort you to assure him of your love for him.... Whom you pardon anything, I also pardon" (2 Cor. 2:7,8,10). Again in the same letter, Paul sounds the same note. The writer is not Saul, "breathing threats of slaughter," but Paul, breathing the love of Christ.

Wherefore I write these things while absent, that, when present, I may not act more severely, according to the power that the Lord has given me for upbuilding, and not for destruction" (2 Cor. 13:10).

Paul realizes that his words may cause a worried heart among his readers. And even though it pains him, he knows that it must be done. For his duty as a preacher of the gospel of Christ demands that he give evil no quarter. If some find his words too hard to bear, Paul must take the risk. "But I will most gladly spend and be spent myself for your souls, even though, loving you more, I be loved less" (2 Cor. 1:15).

No matter how much Paul showed his love, there were inevitably those who could not see eye to eye with him. From the time of Christ on, such has been the fate of practically every great reformer. And even before Christ, the various Socrateses of ancient history were warned by friends that their glasses had been spiked with hemlock. Reform to virtue is a hard saying; and very hard to those who were couched in the luxury of paganism. Charges against Paul flew thick and fast. One that must have stung him painfully was that of insincerity. To his opponents, his burning zeal smacked of fanaticism. They regarded him as a furious zealot, raving and ranting. But his love, none the less, was waiting for their welcome if only they would return to the ideals of Christ.

For our boast is this, the testimony of our conscience that in simplicity and godly sincerity—not in carnal wisdom, but in the grace of God—we have conducted ourselves in the world, and especially in our relations with you. For we write nothing that you do not read and understand, even as you have understood us in part, that we are your boast, as you will also be ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 1:12-14).

Later, he twice gives expression to the same thought.

We, at least, are not, as many others, adulterating the word of God; but with sincerity, as coming from God, we preach in Christ in God's presence (2:17).

...we renounce those practices which shame conceals, we avoid unscrupulous conduct, we do not corrupt the word of God; but making known the truth, we commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God (4:2).

Paul's love extended also to the Judaizers. These were Jewish Christians who insisted on retaining such rites as circumcision, abstinence from unclean food, and the observance of Jewish festivals. They proved to be one of Paul's greatest trials, especially

in Galatia. Stationed temporarily at Ephesus on his third missionary journey, Paul learned that these Jewish Christians had been plying the Galatians with bogus truths. They questioned the divine commission of Paul, charging that his doctrine differed from that of the other apostles. They proscribed his disregard for the sacredness of the Mosaic Law. More than this, they taught that circumcision and the Mosaic Law were necessary for salvation. Paul's zealous spirit arose in protest. He saw all his work set at naught. But the real thorn was this: by listening to the Christian Jews, the Galatians were toying with their salvation. Heavy of heart, Paul writes to them: "O foolish (i.e., without understanding) Galatians! who has bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ has been depicted crucified?.... Are you so foolish that after beginning in the Spirit, you now make a finish in the flesh" (Gal. 3:1,3). Paul tenderly pleads with them to abandon the ritual of the Mosaic Law. For they are now living under the new dispensation: the law of Christ; the law of love.

> ...court the good from a good motive always and not only when I am present with you, my dear children, with whom I am in labor again, until Christ is formed in you! But I wish I could be with you now... because I do not know what to make of you (Gal. 4:18-20).

Despite his grief, Paul bears no ill-will toward the Judaizers. They have pilloried him and his doctrine, but his heart forgives their offense. So great is his love that he would even cut himself off eternally from Christ—if it were possible to harbor such a thought—if he could thereby obtain the salvation of his people. In one of his most revealing passages, he cries: "I speak the truth in Christ, I do not lie, my conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great sadness and continuous sorrow in my heart. *For I could wish to be anathema myself from Christ for the sake of my brethren, who are my kinsmen according to the flesh*... (Rom. 9:1-3). What nobler cry of self-sacrifice has ever issued from the heart of man!

If the Apostle had written not a single word more than chapter thirteen of First Corinthians, his niche in the halls of greatness would already have been carved. For this glorious hymn of love stands unparalleled. Some have called it the greatest thing St. Paul ever wrote; others, the greatest thing ever written. Someone has also said that the charity Paul mentions is a mere synonym for Christ Himself. Substitute *Christ* for *charity*

throughout this canticle, and you are writing Christ's biography. In the same line of thought, it can hardly be called a stretch of the imagination to say that the word *Apostle* might also prove an excellent substitute for *charity*. For, although he himself never dreamt of it, Paul here chronicles an eloquent autobiography.

> Charity is patient, is kind; charity does not envy, is not pretentious, is not puffed up, is not ambitious, is not self-seeking, is not provoked; thinks no evil, does not rejoice over wickedness, but rejoices with the truth; bears with all things, hopes all things, endures all things.... So there abide faith, hope and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity (1 Cor. 13:4-7,13).

Since the day at Three Fountains in Rome when the executioner's sword severed his head, Paul has been a thorn in the side of free-thinkers, a mighty buttress in the structure of Christianity. His towering figure has overshadowed the centuries. Choosing Christ as his model, he moulded himself into a remarkable likeness. This likeness is so great that one can truthfully say, *cor Pauli, cor Christi:* the heart of Paul was the heart of Christ.

Capuchin College
Washington, D. C.

"AXIOS" IN THE GOSPELS

Rev. James A. Kleist, S.J., Ph.D.

One of a group of ingratiating words in the Greek New Testament is *axios.* It makes one curious to know more about it, and it improves on acquaintance. Originally a commercial term, it is apt to worm itself quite unobtrusively into more congenial company.

It was the pre-Christian and contemporary non-Christian Greek literature that shaped the language which the NT writers were to use to promulgate the Good Tidings. Thus, once again, the spoils of Egypt enriched the Chosen People. The best approach to NT word-study is from the side of that literature. Let us, then, see what Liddell and Scott say about *axios. Iliad* 23, 885 presents a typically Homeric picture: an ox is laid upon one scale of a balance, whereupon the other scale shoots up; then a finely wrought cauldron is put upon this other scale, and down it comes till both scales are even. This is the root meaning of *axios* (=*ag-tios*), from *ago,* "to draw down the scale." The cauldron, in other words, is *boos axios,* "worth an ox; of an ox's worth." In Herodotus 1, 107 *hoi heoutou axioi* are "those of one's rank, one's peers." In other words, wherever *axios* comes into play, one thing or person is "weighed" or "balanced" against another thing or person, and both are found to be of "equal weight," whether this weight is physical, or moral, or existing only in the estimation of the persons interested. There are several English adjectives or phrases that will express the idea, as: "counterbalancing; worth; having the weight of; weighing as much as; worth as much as; of like value with; worth the price of; comparable to; equivalent to; of equal rank with; one's equal, peer, or compeer." We shall discover others as we go along. The current rendering "worthy" is not among those just enumerated. In certain contexts, "worthy" is the *mot juste;* we speak, for example, of a "worthy" priest, a "worthy" citizen; we say that a good action is "worthy" of a reward (or, a bad action is "deserving" of punishment). In modern everyday English, "worthy" is, I think, tending to disappear and to be restricted in its use. In Greek, too, *axios* may be used without a descriptive noun, as in Mt. 10:11.

Before I take up the Gospels, a word may be said about St. Paul's use of *axios* in Rom. 8:18, where the New Revision renders: "The sufferings of the present time are not *worthy to*

be compared with the glory to come." Goodspeed: "I consider what we suffer now not *to be compared* with the glory that is to burst upon us." Moffat: "Present suffering, I hold, is *a mere nothing compared* to the glory that we are to have revealed." *The Westminster Version* follows the Douay. *The New Testament in Basic English* says: "I am of the opinion that there *is no comparison* between the pain of this present time and..." The reader who agrees with my point of view in this essay will, I think, like me, prefer Weymouth's translation: "The sufferings of the present are *not worth considering* compared with the glory soon to be disclosed to us," or, better still, Canon Boylan's magnificent version: "I hold that the sufferings of the present are *of no importance in comparison with* the glory which is to be shown forth in us." All these renderings take us back to the root meaning of *axios* as explained above. Their greater or lesser success depends on what their authors consider the most suitable English equivalent.

It is time we turned to the Gospels. Here the word occurs in nine passages in St. Matthew, eight times in St. Luke, and once in St. John.

John 1:26,27: "In your midst is One of whose presence you are not aware—One who comes after me, the strap of whose sandal I am *not fit* to untie," or: "not *good enough* to untie." B. Franklin somewhere speaks of "men fit to command."

Lk. 23:41: "And we suffer rightly; for we are only getting *what we have deserved* for our crimes." The Douay rendering is good, too: "... the *due reward of* our deeds." So, too, is that of the New Revisers, in spite of the slight shift of emphasis from the doers to their deeds: *"what* our deeds *have deserved."*

Lk. 15:21: "The son then said to the father: 'Father, Heaven is witness that I have sinned, and you, too, know that I *am not fit* to be considered your son,' or: 'not *worthy* to be considered.' "

12:48: "If, however, he does not know the will of his master, yet does *things that deserve punishment,* he will be but slightly punished."

Lk. 10:7: "Make your headquarters in the house (*sc.* once chosen), and eat and drink what the inmates offer. After all, the laborer *is entitled to* his wages."

Lk. 23:15: "Nor did Herod either, for he referred his case back to us. This, then, is the upshot (note the much-neglected *idou*!): he has done *nothing to deserve the penalty* of death."

The New Revision: "Nothing *deserving of death* has been committed by him." Many modern English writers avoid the passive construction wherever they can. The Douay's rendering, "nothing worthy of death is done to him," has a strong archaic flavor.

Mt. 22:8: "The wedding feast is ready, but the persons invited to it did not prove themselves *worthy* of it." The adjective "worthy" is always in place where moral responsibility is prominent.

A very difficult passage is Mt. 3:8 (also Lk. 3:8). A first stumbling block is the Semitic use of *karpos* for a person's conduct of life. The idea of "fruit" in this connection is somewhat repellent to us, though it may have to be retained. "Fruit" suggests, of course, the "result" of *tes metanoias.* Also the article *tes* is striking. Does the Baptist take for granted that the Pharisees did possess *metanoia?* He might, of course, do so, considering that they actually came to him, though I suspect that the phrase *tes metanoias* may have a conditional sense: *"if* you have *the metanoia* which everybody is urged to have." It may also be that *tes metanoias* partakes of the force of the imperative *poiesate,* so that the complete sense would be: "make sure of *your* metanoia and then live *accordingly."* The Greek, certainly, would be capable of such compactness of expression. On the whole, I rather like Weymouth's rendering: "Let your lives then *prove your* change of heart." Moffat's is correct but slightly stiff: "Produce fruits that *answer to* your repentance." Goodspeed's is, I think, too bookish: "Produce fruit that will be *consistent with your professed* repentance!" But in both these translations, the sense of *axios* and of the *tes* is well taken care of. The new Revisers, I am glad to see, remodelled the Douay rendering, "Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of penance," into: "fruits *befitting* repentance." But I do not like to see the weighty *metanoia* whittled down to "repentance." Somewhere, if I remember right, Cardinal Newman renders "change of heart and mind," which is more to the point. Other variants may be: "Who has put into your heads the notion of fleeing from the imminent outburst of (God's) anger?—Well, then, let your change of heart and mind bring forth *genuine* fruits." *"Show* by your conduct that you have undergone a change of heart and mind." "Give *adequate* proofs of your conversion." *"If* you are really repentant (or: penitent), then live (or: conduct yourselves) *accordingly"* (or: "let your conduct *prove* it").

Very interesting is the use of *axios* in two sets of texts preserved by St. Matthew, where the word is applied to persons. Mt. 10:11: "Whatever town or village you enter, search out a *worthy* inhabitant (or: *respectable* citizen: the phrase *en aute* is implied in the nouns; literally: in the community), and there make your headquarters till you quit the locality." The connotation in *respectable* was suggested to me by Père Lagrange who quotes Loisy: "S'enquérir *d'une maison respectable,* où ils puissent s'installer sans compromettre l'honneur de l'apostolat." This is excellent. Our Lord continues: "On entering the house, give it your blessing; and in case the household is *responsive* (or: receptive), your blessing will alight upon it; if it is not *responsive,* your blessing will be no loss to you" (will return to you!). In other words, you will lose nothing by having blessed it.

The other set of instances of *axios* is in Mt. 10:37 and the following. V. 37: "He who is fonder of father or mother than of me is not the *right* person for me. He who is fonder of son or daughter than of me is not the *right* person for me. He who will not shoulder his cross and follow me is not the *right kind* of man for me." This rendering will be justified, if it is not yet made clear, by what will be said in the last paragraph. We are now prepared for Lk. 7:4: "When they arrived and were face to face with Jesus, they earnestly pleaded with Him. 'He is the right man for you,' they said, 'to grant this favor to. He is, certainly, fond of our nation and has built the synagogue for us at his own expense.' "

Do I need to justify my point of view in this essay and the illustrations I have given from the Gospels? Translation, as we all know, does not require rigorous adherence to the Greek or Latin mode of expression. "Pater filium amat" means "the father loves his son." That is simple, and the thought stands revealed if each of the Latin words has a corresponding equivalent in the translation. But such symmetry, or such adherence to the original, is not necessary, and frequently is quite out of place. A translation is faithful, in fact, literal, if each of the words in the original is represented in the rendering somehow or other. To be literal or to be faithful does not mean to be slavish.

Let me linger a moment over Christ's words in Mt. 10:37, with the ominous—or, rather, fatal—*ouk* expunged from the sacred text. We have yet to see that originally commercial term in all its glory. A group of young men have just been raised to the

sacerdotal dignity, and are now consecrated to Christ's service. The Bishop and the priests stand aside for a moment, while Christ surveys the brave band. He is pleased with what He sees—bright, eager faces, aglow with devotion to Him. And now He is honoring them with a brief, but affectionate, talk: "From humble walks of life I have chosen you to come forward and take your place *at my side.* I have had you submitted to a long and rigorous course of training, and you *measure up* to my expectations. You do not set attachment to home and earthly comfort above attachment to my Person: you are the *right kind* of men for me. You are ready to shoulder your daily cross and follow me wherever I go: you are *the right kind* of men for me. You are *competent* to preach the Good Tidings to a weary world. You are *fit* to issue commands and guide others in my Name. You possess *the necessary qualifications* for your priestly functions. You shall pronounce the words of consecration and of absolution, and unfathomable mysteries will be accomplished on the altar and in men's souls. You have *risen to my stature. Shoulder to shoulder,* we are going to fight the Evil in the world. You are the peers in my Realm. You are my *compeers.* Live up, then, to your high calling, and prove the quality of your training by *corresponding* lives. Your reward in Heaven will be ample: a laborer is *entitled* to his wages. Consider the sufferings in the world as *of no importance in comparison* with eternal happiness. Be *worthy* priests. Give *adequate proofs* of your high ideals. Your outward conduct must *correspond with* your inward dignity."

This ending to my brief note on *axios* may seem a little fanciful and out of proportion to the use of that word. But my sole purpose in writing it was to make the reader aware of the wealth of meaning contained in a seemingly simple word. Every one of the italicized expressions in Christ's address to the newly ordained is a legitimate development and application of the real meaning of *axios.* The vocabulary of the evangelists was necessarily restricted, but to deny that these men, or our Lord speaking through them, were barren of thought is to insult them. It is the translator's sacred duty to search the whole range of simple, but expressive English, instead of yielding to the convenient method of using the same word in English whenever the corresponding Greek occurs.

St. Louis University

MISSAL EPISTLES FROM ROMANS

Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.S.L.

XV

The following passage is the Epistle for the first Sunday of Advent:

13:11 Understand, for it is now the hour for us to rise
from sleep, because now our salvation is nearer than
12 when we came to believe. The night is far advanced;
the day is at hand. Let us therefore lay aside the
13 works of darkness, and put on the armor of light. Let
us walk becomingly as in the day, not in revelry and
drunkenness, not in debauchery and wantonness, nor
14 in strife and jealousy. But put on the Lord Jesus
Christ.

St. Paul has been discussing the various duties of the Christian life, especially the duty of charity, and now he proposes the most powerful motive for the acquisition and exercise of those virtues,—the thought of eternity. It makes little difference whether the apostle proposes this motive only in reference to the duty of charity, mention of which immediately precedes the present passage, or has in mind all the duties he has considered from the beginning of chapter 12. The thought of the Parousia and of the general judgment is an all powerful motive and is applicable equally in either case.

The sleep from which the apostle exhorts his readers to arise is certainly not the sleep of pagan ignorance and viciousness, for he is addressing those who have already abandoned paganism and embraced Christianity. It must, therefore, be that cooling of first fervor, that constant threat of tepidity and indifference to spiritual and unseen verities, which hangs as a constant threat over all the faithful at all times and must be constantly fought. This threat becomes more serious at those times in the cycle of world affairs when peace, plenty, and prosperity hold sway, for then the world becomes most alluring and its seductive charms tend to obscure the glory of the world to come. Consequently, the exhortation to arise from sleep is always opportune for the faithful of every class—clergy, religious, laity.

The reason given by St. Paul is that *our salvation is nearer than when we came to believe.* Such is the reading of the Vul-

gate; the probably correct Greek reading is, *salvation is nearer to us than when we came to believe. Salvation* here designates complete salvation, which will be realized only with the resurrection of the body at the end of time. St. Paul often uses the term in this sense, but he also uses it of the beginning of salvation which comes when as a result of Faith and Baptism justice is introduced into the soul. From that moment the individual is saved "in hope" (Rom. 8:24), but the full realization of that hope comes only with "the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23) at the general resurrection. Each day brings the Parousia or second coming of Christ closer, when the full brilliance of the eternal day shall dissipate all darkness. In the dawn of this day, which dawn began with the appearance on earth of our Lord, the light that "shines in darkness" (Jn. 1:4), we "see through a mirror in an obscure manner" (1 Cor. 13:12).

This does not mean that St. Paul taught the imminence of the second coming of our Lord. He may have suspected that it was at hand, but he nowhere says so. Rather does he accept the uncertainty of this great day's coming in submission to the Lord's own statement: "Of that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only" (Mk. 13:32). And just as our Lord urged the faithful to vigilance, so too does St. Paul, urging the faithful to ceaseless watchings, for "the day of the Lord is to come as a thief in the night" (1 Thess. 5:2).

The night is far advanced. This can only mean the night of paganism when intellectual darkness held sway and men wandered about in ignorance and unbelief. This period is elsewhere described by the apostle: "You are not to walk as the Gentiles walk in the futility of their mind, having their understanding clouded in darkness, estranged from the life of God through the igorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart. For they have given themselves up in despair to sensuality, greedily practicing every kind of uncleanness" (Eph. 4:18-20).

This night of pagan darkness has been largely dissipated by the advent of Jesus Christ, the light of the world "that enlightens every man that comes into the world" (Jn. 1:9), and thus *the day is at hand.* The full noonday splendor of the Sun of Justice has not yet shone forth; that brilliance is reserved for the Parousia, but there is sufficient glimmering of the coming brightness for the Christian to bestir himself from sleep, and prepare

for the struggle ahead. The aurora of the eternal day is here and dissipates the darkness sufficiently for all to see the truth, although only as "through a mirror in an obscure manner" (1 Cor. 3:12).

Let us therefore lay aside the works of darkness. We are to prepare for the day, which the aurora of the Incarnation announces, first by putting off the works of darkness. St. Paul thinks of these in terms of night dress which one lays aside for the clothing of the day. Works of darkness are those which are "alien to God," as Origen puts it, in other words, sinful deeds of any kind. They are called works of darkness because, as St. Thomas says, they are preferably committed in darkness or in secret, so that they may be hidden from the eyes of men. "For everyone who does evil hates the light, and does not come to the light, that his deeds may not be exposed" (Jn. 3:20). Job develops the same thought at some length (Job 24:13ff.). Another reason for styling sins works of darkness is that they result from neglecting the light of reason and of faith, and a third is that they lead to the darkness "where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Mt. 22:13).

And put on the armor of light. The clothing the Christian is to assume is not the ordinary dress of the working man, but the armor of the soldier. There is struggle ahead in this aurora of the eternal light—struggles against "the wiles of the devil," against "the fiery darts of the most wicked one," against the "spiritual forces of wickedness on high" (Eph. 6:11-17). The Christian has "strongholds" to demolish, subtle and specious reasoning against the truths of faith to overthrow (2 Cor. 10:4). Hence he needs the armor of light, which elsewhere St. Paul calls the "armor of God" and describes in some detail. "Take up the armor of God, that you may be able to resist,.. having girded your loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of justice, and having your feet shod with the readiness of the gospel of peace, in all things taking up the shield of faith... and the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit, that is, the word of God" (Eph. 6:13-17). Elsewhere in slightly different language St. Paul says: "Let us put on the breastplate of faith and charity, and for a helmet the hope of salvation" (1 Thess. 5:8). The armor of light, so called, it seems, to me because it is the light of revealed truth which supplies these arms to us consists in the

Christian virtues, especially the basic virtues of faith, hope and charity. Girding the loins was the first move towards getting ready for action. The long robes, reaching down to the ankles, which the orientals wore had to be gathered up and fastened with a girdle about the loins, lest they impede the freedom of movement of the lower limbs. The metaphor simply means getting ready for action, and in this case, by sincerity of purpose and purity or singleness of intention. The breastplate covers the upper part of the body protecting it from attack. The spiritual breastplate is justice, which is the best possible armor, since it includes all the virtues. If, elsewhere, St. Paul calls it the breastplate of faith and charity, he is simply stating the same thing in other words, since faith which is made active by charity results in the exercise of justice. The feet that are shod with light but firmly fixed sandals are ready for speedy movement. The readiness of the gospel of peace may mean promptness and alacrity of soul, readiness for every struggle and every sacrifice which victory may demand, or, perhaps, it may mean that zeal to spread the truths of the gospel—a very potent weapon for disarming and winning over the adversary, since truth is its own best weapon both of defense and attack. The shield which wards off all the attacks from whatever source they may come is faith, since it has a ready answer for every difficulty, and no assault can shake it. The helmet, which protects the head, a most vital part of the body, is salvation or as St. Paul puts it more clearly elsewhere the hope of salvation. This imparts to the struggling Christian an indomitable courage and unflagging energy to carry on, along with the realization that God is with us, and that thus we cannot but emerge victorious in the struggle. Such are the constituents of the armor of light which the Christian must put on in order to be successful in the struggle against evil.

Let us walk becomingly as in the day. The day of eternity, when the brilliance of the returning Son of God will illuminate all, has not yet come, but its aurora is here—the partial revelation of divine truth which is contained in the Christian teaching. This aurora is properly called day when contrasted with the darkness of pagan ignorance, superstition, and immorality. The Christian should therefore act as one who is in broad daylight, in view of all, becomingly, as St. Paul puts it, i.e., avoiding what is indecent, shameful, dishonorable. When St. Paul wrote these words he probably had in mind the conduct which was quite com-

mon among the pagans of his day. Under cover of darkness the worst excesses were committed. Some of these he mentions: *revelry and drunkenness,* i.e., revelry which results in drunkenness, *debauchery and wantonness,* i.e., debauchery which is utterly wanton, *strife and jealousy,* i.e., strife caused by jealousy. These are some of the works of darkness to which St. Paul refers above.

But put on the Lord Jesus Christ. The negative advice to abandon the works of darkness is followed by this positive injunction. St. John Chrysostom, commenting on this passage, says: "In saying 'put on' he urges us to be girded with Him on every side. As elsewhere he says, "but if Christ be in you" and again "that Christ may dwell in the inner man." For he would have our souls be a dwelling for Himself and Himself to be put around us as a garment, that He may be to us all things both from within and from without." Origen remarks that Christ is often called wisdom, justice, truth, sanctification, etc. He, therefore, who acquires these qualities puts on Christ.

The Christian, St. Paul tells us (Gal. 3:27), puts on Christ at Baptism, but the work of the sacrament must be constantly supplemented by the personal endeavor of the individual. He must strive uninterrutedly by study and meditation on the life of Christ, as presented in the Gospels and interpreted in the Epistles, to become thoroughly permeated with the ideals, the maxims and the example of Christ, and to shape his life accordingly, and thus reflect in his daily conduct the virtues of his Master. St. Thomas writes: "Just as a man is contained in his clothing, and is seen in its colors, so in him who puts on Christ, the works of Christ are seen."

XVI

The following passage is the epistle for the Votive Mass *ad postulandam gratiam bene moriendi* (to petition the favor of dying in the grace of God).

14:7,8 None of us lives to himself, and none dies to himself; for if we live, we live to the Lord, or if we die, we die to the Lord. Therefore, whether we live or die, we
9 are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died and rose again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of
10 the living. But thou, why dost thou judge thy broth-

er? Or thou, why dost thou despise thy brother? For
11 we shall all stand at the judgment-seat of God; for it
is written,
"As I live, says the Lord,
to me every knee shall bend,
and every tongue shall give praise to God."
12 Therefore everyone of us will render an account for
himself to God.

The foregoing passage occurs in a section where St. Paul is making a particular application of the principles of Christian charity he has been expounding. The particular situation is that of two groups of the faithful who were inclined to criticize and condemn each other. The one group, designated as "the strong," was composed of the better instructed Christians who had correctly arrived at the conscientious conviction that they were permitted to eat any kind of food or take any kind of drink, since all foods and drink were pure. The other group, designated as "the weak," was made up of the poorly instructed who had arrived at the erroneous conviction that to eat certain foods and take certain drinks was sinful. St. Paul after stating the problem advises them to be patient and understanding towards each other. Each group, he argues, has arrived at its position out of the pure intention of pleasing the Lord. He gives the reason for this in the first part of our passage, and in the latter part he tells them that they should not presume to judge one another.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

Rev. William McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

XXII

136. Psalm 140:5c-7a. (Friday, at Vespers.)

(5) *Quoniam adhuc et oratio mea in beneplacitis eorum.*
(6) *Absorpti sunt juncti petrae judices eorum:*
audient verba mea quoniam potuerunt.
(7) *Sicut crassitudo terrae erupta est super terram,*
dissipata sunt ossa nostra secus infernum.

Preserving the words of this perplexing passage as in V and the Breviary, we have rearranged their metrical grouping as MT retains it. Jerome also adopts this division, except to make 5c the first member of a tristich with 6, instead of the third member of a preceding one. Either is metrically possible; whereas after 5c the pairing of the thoughts is more clearly determined. Jerome's version may be set in contrast:

(6) *Quia adhuc oratio mea pro malitiis eorum:*
sublati sunt juxta petram judices eorum,
et audient verba mea, quoniam decora sunt.
(7) *Sicut agricola cum scindit terram:*
sic dissipata sunt ossa nostra in ore inferni.

The general theme of the Psalm is fervent petition for strength to resist temptation to sinful speech and action. But there is wide difference of opinion about the nature of the Psalmist's situation and the consequent sequence of his thought, so that guiding principles are hard to determine. Furthermore, parts of the text are evidently corrupted.

Beneplacitis in 5c, due to LXX, is harmonized with MT by Jerome's alteration to *malitiis*. The governing preposition, however, is not *pro*, but *in* understood as "against." The obvious sense is "For my prayer is ever against their wickedness."

In 6a the original of *absorpti sunt* opens paths in opposite directions. The Hebrew verb is primarily "let fall" or "throw down," but also means "let go, release" from obligation or exaction. It shows this force in a derivative noun denoting the "remission" of the year of jubilee. Here, in the passive, the verb is followed by the phrase "on" or "at the sides of a rock" or "cliff." Its subject is "their judges" or "leaders."

Boylan and Bird prefer the sense which the latter renders "their judges are flung down the side of the crag." But 6b fol-

lows with the clear statement "they heard my words, because they were gracious." LXX correctly wrote ἡδύνθησαν, "were sweetened," which V rendered as *potuerunt*—as Schleusner thinks, not in error for a passive form of δύναμαι, but interpreting "sweetened" words as "potent." This justifies Boylan in giving V the translation "my words are powerful"; but no such meaning attaches to the Hebrew itself. The latter makes it difficult to understand 6a of violent treatment, and rather suggests (especially after "prayer against their wickedness") that the leaders of the foe were for a time won over by leniency. To this extent it seems that Zorell follows the truer course in translating *Incolumes dimissi sunt, apud rupem, duces illorum.* Hence we prefer "Their leaders were released on the edges of the cliff: they heard my words, because they were gracious."

Verse 7 seems to complain that the leaders have proved ungrateful by reverting to hostility; its picture of their devastations prepares us for the concluding prayer (8-10) for protection against them. The description in 7b clearly reads, "strewn are our bones at the mouth of Sheol." But 7a is the first member of a simile illustrating the picture; and the former labors under difficulties probably due to corruption. MT seems to read "Like one cleaving and breaking in the earth," i.e., "as when one," etc. Plowing and harrowing, or the like operations, break the clods of earth small and scatter them. So (it would seem) the aggressor's violence leaves not even the bodies of his victims intact, but only their bones "scattered at the mouth of the grave."

Much must remain in doubt about this passage, but its most reasonable explanation appears to be the following:

(5) *For my prayer is ever against their wickedness.*
(6) *Their leaders were released on the edges of the cliff;*
they heard my words, because they were gracious.
(7) *As when one cleaves and sunders in the earth,*
our bones are strewn at the mouth of Sheol.

137. Psalm 140:10b. (Friday, at Vespers.)

Cadent in retiaculo ejus peccatores: *singulariter sum ego donec transeam.*

The original here was clearly identical with MT, but was not easy to reproduce verbatim in Western idiom. At any rate, *sum* should be discarded; it was supplied in error by LXX where no copula was needed.

Proper adverbs are few in Hebrew, which uses substantives modified into adverbial phrases, often with no governing preposition expressed. So with *singulariter*. Its original radically means "unitedness, state of unity," which in the adverbial accusative becomes "together" (in either space or time). It is the same expression which, in a more frequent collateral Hebrew form, is usually *in idipsum*. In our context it is either "at the same time" or "in the mean time." The pronoun "I" which follows, emphatically anticipates the subject of *transeam*, which Hebrew independently expresses by the form of the verb itself. Verbally this results in "At the same time, I—I pass on" (like the French, *moi, je passerai*). The emphatic pronoun preceding may be neglected in translation. As if it were not present at all in MT, the finite verb is immediately preceded by a conjunction, correctly rendered by *donec*, since it means (in such a construction) either "while" or "until." The psalmist prays that sinners may be caught in their own trap, while he passes by unharmed.

There remains some doubt of the position and reference of *singulariter*. Symmachus and the Syriac attach it to the first member, an arrangement followed by the version of the Anglican Prayer Book: "Let the ungodly fall into their own nets together." This is more in keeping with the Hebrew fashion of placing an adverb at the end of a clause; but it adds what the sense hardly seems to require. Boylan, preferring this division, incorrectly ascribes it to Jerome, whom he reports as writing *Incident in rete ejus impii simul: ego autem transibo:* whereas Jerome actually has *Incident in rete ejus impii: simul autem ego transibo.* Bird errs in the same way about Jerome, without misquoting him. As to the adverb's order in the sentence, it does sometimes stand at the beginning in poetry, especially for emphasis' sake; moreover, unless it does so here, there is notable disturbance of the metrical balance in MT.

It seems that *singulariter* should be taken as beginning the second member. The resulting construction seems confused to our ways of expression: "At the same time, I—while I pass on." However, the emphatic "I" may be either neglected or anticipated. "While I at the same time pass on" is Brown's rendering in his Lexicon.[1] Zorell too prefers *dum simul ego salvus evadam.* In Hebrew syntax the wording of such a sentence is not too much confused. Reason seems to favor the simpler rendering,

[1] Brown-Driver-Briggs, pp. 403, 725.

Let the wicked fall into their own snare,
while I at the same time pass on.

138. Psalm 143:13b. (Saturday, at Vespers.)

Promptuaria eorum plena, *eructantia ex hoc in illud.*

Eorum in the first member should have been *nostra,* and so with the person of the possessive pronouns throughout the whole context, 12-14. The psalmist invokes the blessings of prosperity: "May our garners be full." The obscure clause which follows means "providing from kind to kind," i.e., "all kinds" of stores or produce. The word "kind" seems to have been mistaken by LXX (as it easily could have been) for a demonstrative pronoun. Its restoration gives us

May our garners be full,
and furnish all kinds of stores.

139. Psalm 149:5b. (Saturday, at Lauds.)

Exultabunt sancti in gloria: *laetabuntur in cubilibus suis.*

If one's bed seems a strange place from which to "shout for joy," the incongruity is partly due to poetic hyperbole and partly to our lack of *rapport* with the course of the poet's thought. The original of *laetabuntur* expresses a vocal utterance of unrestrained joy, which moderns usually render "utter a ringing cry" or "shout for joy." The original of *cubilibus* is not the commonest term for "bed" in Hebrew. A few times[2] we have had occasion to notice a verb generally rendered *dormire* by V, but really meaning merely "lie down" or "be at rest," sometimes no more than "dwell in peace." From this root is formed the present noun, "beds, couches, resting-places." To appreciate it here we need the implication that the victorious warrior or the author of successful achievement does not give full vent to his gratification until effort is ended and he can utterly relax. Thus it is not so strange, after all, to assure oneself that

The pious will rejoice in honor,
they will shout for joy on their couches.[3]

Woodstock, Maryland
Woodstock College

[2] *CBQ* I, p. 248; II, pp. 67, 257.

[3] Editor's Note: This, unfortunately, terminates the series of articles written by Fr. McClellan on the Psalms.

CORRESPONDENCE

This department has been inaugurated to afford our readers an opportunity to express their views on scriptural topics, whether they have been discussed in the Quarterly or not. Publication of these views does not imply that they are endorsed by the editors; they remain the private views of the writers, who alone are to be held accountable for them. Queries of sufficient interest and importance will also be answered.

Non-Catholic Pictorial Children's Bibles: A Query

Editors: I hope I am not taking too great liberty in proposing to you a question on which I need some help. Are Catholic teachers bound not to permit the use, at home as well as at school, of the Bible stories for children that use the King James text or another modern text and not the Douay?

Some of these books are very suitable for introducing the children to the literature of the Bible. Artistically, they attract children more than the Bible history books in use in our schools. This year Viking Press brought out a book called *Small Rain*, a book of illustrations of Bible texts for children. There is little text and no text which has a significant change from the Douay. But the title (Deut. 32:2) indicates that it is a King James text. I wrote to Viking asking if this book could be brought out in the Douay text, and they replied that it would not be possible, since, in the past, when they presented two editions of such a book, there was no demand for the Catholic text.

Is every book of biblical selections from the Protestant English versions actually on the index? May I suggest that an analysis of this question would be helpful to Catholic librarians and teachers?

Dubitans.

The Answer

The question is asked whether Catholic teachers are bound not to permit the use either at home or in school of Bible stories for children that use biblical texts taken from translations other than the Douay, even when these texts bear but an extremely limited proportion to the space taken up by the illustrations and when they do not depart in any significant detail from the Douay version.

In interpreting Canon 1391, which requires that translations of the Sacred Scriptures into the vernacular be made only with the approval of the Holy See or under the supervision of the local Ordinary with proper annotations, authors generally concede that books of prayers containing scriptural quotations, or Bible histories are not translations of the Sacred Scriptures as contemplated by this canon. The same conclusion seems justified as to Canon 1399, 1°, where the translations of the Sacred Scriptures made by non-Catholics are for-

bidden. It would seem, therefore, that the illustrated booklets in question are not forbidden as translations of the Sacred Scriptures made by non-Catholics.

However, even the illustrations could be forbidden as falling under the category of those foreign to the mind and the decrees of the Church as proscribed in Canon 1399, 12°. Moreover, the tracts themselves, inasmuch as they deal with religion and are written by non-Catholics, are forbidden under Canon 1399, 4°, unless it is clear that they contain nothing contrary to Catholic faith.

If these books were published by a Catholic, the imprimatur would be required both for the pictorial illustrations (Canon 1385, §1, 3°) and for the text, inasmuch as it is dedicated to religious instruction (Canon 1385, §1, 2°). However, the mere fact that the imprimatur has not been obtained, as, in fact, it is not obtained when non-Catholic authors are involved, does not cause the illustrations or the text to be forbidden to the reader.

If the Church wishes the illustrations and the text scrutinized when a Catholic is the author, it would seem obvious that the same authority, competent to issue the imprimatur, should be consulted to pass on whether the illustrations in a work composed by a non-Catholic contain anything contrary to the mind or the decrees of the Church, and whether the text in the same work contains anything contrary to Catholic doctrine. Considering the fact that under Canon 1381, §3, books used in the teaching of religion in Catholic schools are to be approved by the local ordinary, it is obvious that the booklets involved in the question should be submitted to the local Ordinary for his approval before they could be used in the Catholic school. It would be a very subtle distinction that would permit a teacher of religion to tell a child that he can use at home a book that he can not use in school. Consequently, it seems indicated that these text books can not be put at all into the hands of pupils by their teachers unless they have been previously approved by the local Ordinary.

REV. JEROME D. HANNAN, S.T.D., J.C.D.
Associate Professor of Canon Law
The Catholic University of America

THE EPILEPSY OF ST. PAUL

EDITORS: Since psychiatry is my profession, I was interested in Fr. Lilly's discussion of St. Paul's alleged epilepsy. Actual diagnosis is impossible under the circumstances, and epilepsy is not at all clearly indicated.

But, although it is impossible to define the character of St. Paul's affliction, there is no great difficulty in granting, for the sake of argument, that it might have been epilepsy. The presence of this

disease would not prove that St. Paul was inferior in intelligence or will-power. This is evident from the improved or newly discovered techniques which have been employed during the last ten years in the study and treatment of epilepsy. Catholic apologists naturally dread to admit that any of the saints might have been afflicted in this way. But a consideration of epilepsy in the light of modern research show that this dread is much exaggerated.

From the experimental and clinical data obtained by the new techniques, the nature of epilepsy yields itself to analysis with the following results. Any person can be made to have a loss of consciousness and convulsions. The introduction into the normal human being of various physical and chemical agents can produce the epileptic picture.

Direct stimulation of the central nervous system by a certain type of electric current (the electric shock treatment of psychoses) produces, in orderly rapid succession, loss of consciousness, convulsions, stupor, confusion, re-orientation with amnesia and, finally, ordinary functioning of the individual—the exact counterpart of the epileptic "march." Metrazol, injected intravenously, produces a similar picture, differing only in this that loss of consciousness accompanies but does not precede the convulsion. Less directly, the epileptic syndrome can be produced by a lowering of the concentration of sugar in the blood —hypoglycaemia. This occurs at will when insulin in appropriate dosage is injected. It occurs spontaneously in certain endocrine metabolic disturbances. The deprivation of parathyroid secretion, as it occurs accidentally in the surgical removal of the thyroid gland, and spontaneously in certain diseases, produces a lowering of calcium in the circulating blood and induces a convulsive state which can be relieved by the administration of calcium salts and parathyroid extracts. The removal of a post-traumatic epileptogenic island in a normal brain restores the person to normal function.

I have cited these rather few technical instances of experimentally controlled epilepsy to exemplify the following important conclusion. Convulsions and disturbances of consciousness, either singly or chronically, are not the expression of any single pathology. There are many causes. Moreover, there is no necessary correlation between the convulsion and the degree of intelligence, emotional control, moral habit, age, or state of life of the patient.

There are, however, individual degrees of susceptibility to epileptogenic agents. Some individuals may have chronic convulsions under stimuli of very mild metabolic changes. Recent blood studies show that these individuals habitually do not have enough carbohydrate consumption to keep up a stable concentration of carbon dioxide in the brain circulation. The aim of therapy in this condition is the production of a continuous mild acidosis. This acidotic state may be

induced in whole or in part by the following means: (1) starvation, (2) a ketogenic diet in which fats must be higher than proteins or carbohydrates, (3) reduction of fluid intake to a minimum, (4) increased expenditure of energy through great physical activity, (5) emotional stability by avoiding anxiety and fear, which produce rapid changes in the acid-akaline balance of the body.

This therapeutic program offers a fascinating hypothesis concerning the illness of St. Paul. His vigorous, austere life, the dietary limitations of his time, his country and economic station, and his abiding faith, which counteracted anxiety and fear, would be considered today an ideal regime for control of convulsions.

While it is true that the measures outlined above may control epilepsy, heroic virtue is necessary for such a routine. This is a rare achievement. So modern medicine offers pharmaceutical crutches. These drugs, singly or in various combinations, together with a practical general acidosis routine, are effective in reducing and eventually abolishing convulsions in idiopathic epilepsy and in other types.

For a long time medical literature has spoken of the "epileptic personality." Now it, too, resolves itself from an indefinite entity into modifiable details. Putnam calls attention to the fact that the socalled epileptic "lack of social adaptability," as described by Talbot (*Treatment of Epilepsy*, 1930), is the type of personality change seen in any chronic illness: "dependence, limitation of horizon, rigidity in habits and feelings of insecurity and anxiety." To this, epilepsy adds the particular "horrors" of the convulsion—namely, fear of humiliation, of bodily injury to self and others, and the oppression, socially and economically, of popular ignorance and prejudice. A third factor is added by the stupefying effect of the sedative drugs if they are incorrectly administered. The current opinion on the epileptic personality is delivered by Dr. Putnam thus: "Physcians who have contact with a large number of patients outside institutions generally agree that, as a group, they are outstandingly even tempered, uncomplaining, and devoted and that among them are to be found many unusually stable, intelligent, and delightful personalities."

In conclusion, I would characterize the newer knowledge of epilepsy by saying that it presents a sound practical basis for understanding and treating the syndrome and a hopeful vista for a permanent cure. I would recommend to interested readers: *Convulsive Seizures, A Manual for Patients, their Families, and Friends*, by Tracy J. Putnam (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1943).

DOROTHY E. DONLEY, M.D.
Assistant Professor of Psychiatry
The Catholic University of America

BIBLICAL NEWS

In the death of His Emminence, William Cardinal O'Connell, the Catholic Biblical Association has lost one of its earliest supporters and most loyal friends. Officially and personally interested in the work of the Association, His Eminence became one of its first patrons and up to the time of his death continued to encourage those engaged in the revision of the English Bible. Because of his genuine interest, he arranged for the wide distribution in 1941 of the Confraternity New Testament among Catholics of the Archdiocese and co-operated in its distribution also among non-Catholics. His annual letter on Sacred Scripture was read on Biblical Sunday throughout the Archdiocese and he constantly urged his priests to develop among the laity the valuable habit of regular Bible reading. May the soul of this true lover of God's word, who became "from the heart a pattern to the flock," rest in peace.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Edward P. Graham, LL.D., a staunch supporter and patron of the Catholic Biblical Association from its inception, passed to his eternal rest last March in Canton, Ohio. May he rest in peace!

The next meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association is scheduled to be held at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana, on Tuesday and Wednesday, August 22 and 23. The program, which is tentatively arranged, lists discussions on the recent Biblical Encyclical by the Reverend Barnabas Ahern, C.P., and the Reverend William Kenneally, C.M.; a discussion on recent theories on Ezechiel by the Reverend Michael Gruenthaner, S.J., on Orphism and the New Testament by the Reverend Richard Murphy, O.P.; on ways and means of making the active members of the Association more active by the Reverend Cyril Gaul, O.S.B.; on the method of defending the Scriptures against present day attacks by the Reverend Anthony Cotter, S.J., and a lecture by Doctor William F. Albright of Johns Hopkins University on the Canaanite language and biblical Hebrew. There will also be a business meeting, featuring an address by the President of the Association, the Very Reverend Donat Poulet, O.M.I., the reports of various committees and the election of officers. There will probably be a luncheon meeting, featuring short addresses by the President of St. Mary's College and by a member of the Hierarchy. More detailed information will be sent to the members shortly before the meeting.

On March 21, 1944, the Reverend Walter Duffy, O.M.C., passed the oral examination and defended his thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology at the

Catholic University of America. The subject of Father Duffy's thesis was "The Tribal Theory of Hebrew Origins." On May 6, the Reverend Conrad Louis, O.S.B., passed the oral examination and defended his thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology at the Catholic University of America. The Subject of Father Louis' thesis was "The Theology of Psalm VIII, a study of the traditions of text and theological import." Both Father Louis and Father Duffy are active members of the Association and majored in Sacred Scripture at the Catholic University.

According to a news item in the *Register* the Reverend Cosmas Korb, O.M.C., professor of history at the Catholic Boys' High School, Trenton, New Jersey, has a collection of coins containing every coin mentioned in the Bible except two.

Back Numbers of the Review Wanted

In order to supply the demand for back numbers of the Quarterly, the Association is anxious to secure the following back numbers:

April 1940, Vol. 2, No. 2.
October 1941, Vol. 3, No. 4.

$1.00 will be paid for each copy of the above issues of the Quarterly. Send them to

CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

Dom Salmon of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Jerome has recently presented to the Holy Father the fifth volume of the Revision of the Vulgate. This latest volume of the Benedictine Recension contains the first two books of Kings.

The latest Bulletin of the Catholic Biblical Association of England carries the following interesting announcement: "One of the most interesting events of recent months was the announcing of the formation of a committee to prepare a one-volume commentary on the Bible. At the 1942 meeting of the Association it was generally agreed that such a work was desirable. Now, thanks to the initiative of Dom Bernard Orchard, O.S.B., M.A., of Downside Abbey, the work has been begun . . . The aim of the commentary is to sum up and codify in a handy and practical form the accepted results of Catholic Biblical scholarship during the past forty years, and to put them at the disposal not only of priests and clerical students, but of Catholic teachers and educated laymen . . . It is intended to present the Catholic standpoint in Biblical Matters in the same way as Peake's Commentary

presents the Non-Conformist and Gore's New Commentary the Anglican view..."

The Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has appointed the Reverend Stephen Hartdegen, O.F.M., corresponding secretary of the Revision Committee of the Old Testament. Father Hartdegen takes the place formerly held by the Reverend Dr. Patrick W. Skehan, who still continues as a member of the Editorial Board.

In view of the recent directives of the Holy See and in particular in view of the Encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, the Episcopal Committee has directed the Editorial Board to relinquish their project of revising the English of the Challoner Old Testament and instead to undertake a translation of the Old Testament from the original texts, Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic. This work is now under way.

PRINCIPLES FOR THE TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FROM THE ORIGINAL

1. In accordance with the Encyclical's (*Divino Afflante Spiritu*) urgent recommendation of recourse to the original texts and of textual criticism, the translation of the Old Testament is to be made from the original languages.

2. In the Proto-Canonical Books the basic text will be the Hebrew and the Aramaic (when this is the language of the Massoretic text). Editions recommended for this text: Hebrew: Ginsburg and Kittle-Kahle, 3rd. ed., 1937; Greek: Swete, Old Testament in Greek. (Naturally the large Göttingen and Cambridge Septuagint editions should be consulted for the books thus far published)

3. When no satisfactory sense can be got out of the text (Massoretic text; consonantal text) with help from the cognate languages in matters of grammar, meanings of words, etc., corrections are to be made with the help of the ancient versions. The Revisers are to communicate to the Editorial Committee the readings supposed by their corrections in order to prevent misunderstandings and delays.

4. Conjectural emendations may be proposed by the Revisers, but should *not* be incorporated into the translation itself. In a work like ours, corrections (emendations) should be, as a rule, made on the authority of external evidence.

5. In the Deutero-Canonical Books the basic text will be the Greek, as the language of the composition or the oldest form of the text

according to the Books. Special problems concerning individual books will be examined jointly by the Revisers and the Editorial Committee.

6. The principles of textual criticism will be followed in the establishment of the text of these books as in the case of the Proto-Canonical Books (cf. No. 3 and No. 4).

7. Important differences between the revised text of the Old Testament and the Vulgate should be noticed so as to give recognition to the authority of the Vulgate as the official text of the Latin Church. This will be done ordinarily by providing translations of the Vulgate text in the notes.

8. Suggestions concerning better sequence of verses or sections in the text may be made in the notes, as was allowed formerly.

9. The form of the Proper Names will be determined by the findings of the editor (Rev. M. Hofer) appointed for this purpose. His conclusions will be communicated to the Revisers as soon as possible.

10. To expedite matters the manuscript of the revised text will ordinarily be gone over and the final decision reached by the Editorial Committee without sending the manuscript back to the Revisers.

11. Other points of the old principles of revision not conflicting with the revised principles stated above (No. 1-10) shall continue in force.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

OLD TESTAMENT AND RELATED SUBJECTS
REV. JOHN P. WEISENGOFF, S.T.D., S.S.L.
REV. PATRICK W. SKEHAN, S.T.D.

Biblical Archaeologist, 6, 1943. Nelson Glueck, "The Jordan" (62-67). A popular resumé of the writer's recent exploratory study of ancient sites mainly on the eastern side of the river. "It is possible to say now that the Jordan valley in ancient times was perhaps the richest single part of all ancient Palestine or Transjordan." The modern "barrenness and desolateness are illusory, being temporary phenomena caused and removable by human factors."

J. Philip Hyatt, "The Writing of an Old Testament Book" (71-80). A detailed description, appropriately illustrated, and with the pertinent Hebrew terms transcribed, of the techniques and materials for ancient Hebrew writing.

Ibid., 7, 1944. H. G. May, "Synagogues in Palestine" (1-20). A general survey of the present state of our knowledge of the synagogue as a place of worship in Palestine from the second century of the Christian era into Byzantine times; with appropriate sidelights from Dura and from Jewish literature. Illustrations and plans are included.

Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 92, 1943. Nelson Glueck, "Ramoth Gilead" (10-16). Places the city at modern *Tell Ramîth*, and not at *el-Husn* or *Ramtheh*, for reasons based on the literary sources, the place-name, and conformity of the pottery evidence. The various "Mispah" sites sometimes identified with Ramoth-Gilead are also discussed. Against a theory of De Vaux, Glueck holds for placing the Mispah of Jacob (Gen. 31:48-49) in North Gilead, rather than south of the Jabbok at *Kh. Jelʿad*. Jephte's home (Jud. 11:11,34) would likewise have been in North Gilead.

W. F. Albright, "The Gezer Calendar" (16-20). Would set the date of this famous epigraphic remnant between 950 and 918 B.C., from indications based on the history of Gezer, a comparative epigraphical treatment, and the presence of what seems to be the Hebrew name "Abia" on the stone. Most interesting is the revised treatment of the text itself.

Nelson Glueck, "On the Site of Asophon in the Jordan Valley" (26-27). Maintains the Hellenistic "Asophon" transferred the earlier name "Saphon" to a new location. Completes an earlier discussion, *ibid.*, nos. 90, 91 (1943).

W. F. Albright, "A Tablet of the Amarna Age from Gezer" (28-30). Revised study of a cuneiform tablet first published in 1909 as a result of Macalister's excavations. The key word is 'tax-collector,' for

which an obscure ideogram was employed. The tablet was written by the Egyptian scribe of "an Egyptian official in Palestine to the prince of Gezer or someone acting as chief," and is datable to perhaps the fifteenth century B.C.

Harvard Theological Review, 36, 1943. G. Zuntz, "On the Opening Sentence in Melito's Homily" (299-315). Maintains that the wording of the recently edited homily on the Passion indicates the reading of the text of Exodus *in Hebrew*, with subsequent explanation in Greek, immediately before delivery of the homily. This might have happened at Sardis, but Palestine, which Melito actually visited, would be an even more likely place. Campbell Bonner, the original editor, refers (*ibid.*, 317-19) to an article of V. Wood, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, 22, 1941, 619-22, which suggests that the reading of Exod. 12 preceded that of the Gospel of the Passion according to St. John at the time of Melito's homily, as it still does in the Latin Church. The expression "the Hebrew Exodus" may mean the book *belonging to* the Hebrews, rather than a Hebrew text of the book.

Jewish Quarterly Review, 34, 1943-44. H. M. Orlinsky, "On Biblical *Tôpeś-Tôpśê*" (281-97). Objects to the secondary meaning of "be skilful, expert in" which is frequently attributed to the root תפש in Gen. 4:21; Num. 31:27; Jer. 2:8; 46:9; 50:16; Ezech. 27:29; 38:4 and Amos 2:15. Traces this meaning to the Brown-Driver-Briggs dictionary as its starting point; offers "to lay hold of" as the root meaning. Adduces the Hebrew of Ecclus. 15:1 with other arguments to show that the תפשׂי־תורה of Jer. 2:8 "refers simply to anyone who obeys the teachings of the Lord." In Num. 31:27 תפשי is a corruption for אנשי.

E. L. Marwick, "Studies in Salmon ben Yeruham" (313-20; 475-80). The commentary on Lamentations of this tenth- century Karaite writer is examined for evidence it affords that the author had written long Judaeo-Arabic commentaries of other parts of the Old Testament as well, though these are not known to have survived. Pertinent extracts are offered as possible clues for identification of similar material elsewhere.

Frank Zimmerman, "The Perpetuation of Variants in the Masoretic Text" (459-74). "Takes the view that for a brief, short-lived period in the history of the Hebrew text, a school of proto-Masoretes attempted to imbed in the text variant readings." A long series of well-chosen instances are given; on the basis of Septuagint indications that some of the variants involved were not met by the Greek translators, "the date of this masoretic school must be placed subsequent to 250 B.C.E. and antecedent to Akiba."

Journal of Biblical Literature, 62, 1943. J. Morgenstern, "Deutero-Isaiah's Terminology for 'Universal God'" (269-80). Not only יהוה

and אל but also the pronoun הוא, substantively and without antecedent, is used in the later chapters of Isaias "as a synonym of יהוה to designate the Deity as the eternally existent One, the God of time and history." Possible instances of similar usage in other parts of the Old Testament are sought: Exod. 3:1-15 is one passage examined at length.

R. Gordis, " A Note on *Yad*" (341-44). Lists a group of instances in which ביד "in the hand of, by the agency of" seems to have been substituted for בעד, "for" (the reverse change in Joel 2:8). The changes may be due to phonetic or to graphic confusion. Three further passages (2 Sam. 18:18, Job 20:10, Isa. 56:5) are adduced for a metaphorical meaning, "offspring," for the word *yad*.

T. H. Gaster, "On Habbakuk 3:4" (345-6). Maintains the text, with the single change of *wᵉšam* to *yaśem*. Understands "the picture ... of the sun's rays peering over the horizon, while its full strength and grandeur is still hidden in the darkness." In Hab. 3:7 and Ps. 97:4, the writer suggests a contamination of the root רתת by forms from ראה.

The book reviews in the Old Testament section (347-75) include long studies of Torczyner's *Book of Job* (Orlinsky), Allis' *Five Books of Moses* (Albright), and Heidel's *Babylonian Genesis* (Albright).

Ibid., 63, 1944. G. Levi della Vida, "El 'Elyon in Genesis 14:18-20" (1-9). Infers from various indications, including the occurence of *El, 'Elyon* and *Šamēn* as three separate divinities in the Sujin inscription from the eighth century B.C., that the name *El* was applied by the Canaanites to a god of earth, as opposed to *'Elyon*, god of heaven. Supposes in the biblical writer a desire to harmonize these tendencies by identifying the two names.

E. G. Kraeling, "The Handwriting on the Wall" (11-18). Reviews the arguments against taking the cryptic words as fundamentally names of coins. *Tekel* as a coin occurs in the Assuan papyri. *Peres*, singular, may have been the original reading, but the existing plural form could be explained as having actually a dual meaning (cf. possible cases in Dan. 7:25 and 12:7). One meaning suggested is, "A mina in Persian weight." More extended treatment is given to the possibility that all the terms are names of coins, each of which places a relative value on one of the successors of Nabuchodonosor—Nabonidus and Belshazzar together being represented by *uparsin*.

H. M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew Root ŠKB" (19-44). With the verb from this root, the distinction of prepositions employed, as between עם and את, is not a distinction in meaning, but a source-distinction. עם alone occurs in Deuteronomy. Before pronoun suffixes, את takes sometimes with this verb the form אות־, which is neither the sign of the accusative nor an erroneous form, but means "with" as it stands.

This interpretation is supported by the occurrence of אות in the meaning "with" in 1(3) Kings 20- 2(4) Kgs. 8, and elsewhere. Some derivatives of the root שכב require a separate origin from a word with those consonants meaning "be poured out." Other morphological points are discussed.

A. M. Honeyman, "Traces of an Early Diacritic Sign in Isaiah 8:6b" (45-50). Reads *wᵉmašu* for ומשוש on the theory that the extra *šin* was originally a supralinear letter written over the *šin* which is proper to the text, to guarantee against its being taken for *śin*. The sign of a pronunciation *śin* for the ambivalent *šin-śin* character would be a supralinear *samekh* (cf. the peculiar בושסכם in Amos 5:11).

T. H. Gaster, "Two Notes on Nahum" (51-52). Text-critical proposals for Nahum 1:12 and 2:4.

G. Zuntz, "The Greek Text of Enoch 102:1-3" (53-54). A revised reconstruction, see Torrey in *JAOS* 62 (1942) 52-60 and Zuntz, *JBL* 61 (1942) 197-201.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 3, 1944. R. A. Bowman, "Yahweh the Speaker" (1-8). For the root of the tetragrammaton, Bowman appeals to Ugaritic *hwt* and Akkadian *awâtu*, both meaning "word." "Strict etymology permits the meaning 'Speaker' for the name of Yahweh. The nature of Hebrew religion ... supports such an interpretation."

Waldo H. Dubberstein, "Assyrian-Babylonian Chronology (669-612 B.C.)" (38-42). Would date the end of Assurbanipal's reign at 633 B.C., or at latest, 631 B.C. Kandalanu of Babylon is not a separate name for Assurbanipal, but a different individual. "If Nabopolassar was appointed as Sealands administrator by Sin-shar-ishkun, the death of Assur-bani-apal must have occurred before 630 B.C."

A. T. Olmstead, "Tattenai, Governor of 'Across the River'" (46). Re-examination of a tablet from Babylon first published in 1907, and dated to June 5, 502 B.C., identifies this governor under his own name (which is Aramaic), so that the identification with the Iranian official Ushtani, long in favor, is to be abandoned.

H. H. Rowley, "Early Levite History and the Question of the Exodus" (73-78). Latest in a series of articles in various journals (the author lists them in a footnote) placing the entrance into Palestine of Juda, Simeon and Levi from the south in the period before Moses, with Merneptah as the Pharaoh of the Exodus for the other tribes. What we know of the Levites and of Moses' family in particular is said to bear this out, if we assume that Levitical elements followed the "Rachel" tribes into Egypt after a setback of Simeon and Levi in the region of Sichem. A basis for the taking of Sichem by the Hebrews in the Amarna age (cf. Gen. 34) is sought in the activities

of the Habiru described in Amarna letters 289 and 256 (ed. Knudtzon).

J. P. Hyatt, "The Sources of the Suffering Servant Idea" (79-86). Makes the concept of the Servant of Yahweh "a fluid and shifting one." Singles out four elements as ready to hand in the environment of the prophet which are alleged to have been sources for his idea "that suffering which is faithfully and willingly borne may be vicariously redemptive." These are, the idea of corporate personality, the Hebrew conception of the prophet and his role, the ideas underlying the Israelite sacrificial system, and "the myth of the dying-rising god." The interpretations given of many single expressions in Isa. 53 are the traditional ones, with only the application to Christ needed to give them point.

W. F. Stinespring, "Note on Ruth 2:19" (101). אִיפֹה and אָנָה, both translated "where" in this verse, require separate treatment. The latter word involves the idea of a goal (usually it means "whither") and might here be rendered as, "to what purpose."

Journal of Theological Studies, 44, 1943. J. R. Porter, "The Role of Kadesh-Barnea in the Narrative of the Exodus" (139-43). Follows in the path of Rowley in his general view of the Exodus; finds "difficulties . . . best resolved . . . by postulating two different sojourns at that place [Cades] by two distinct Israelite groups at the time of the entry into Canaan."

National Geographic Magazine, 85, 1944. Nelson Glueck, "On the Trail of King Solomon's Mines" (233-56). A popular account of the author's activities in the Arabah, and of the modern state of that region. Furnished with a good map and interesting illustrations.

BOOK REVIEWS

PRADO, REV. JOHN, C.SS.R., *Synopsis Evangelica* (Madrid: Edit. El Perpetuo Socorro, 1943). Pp. xxxi, 239; plates 2. 20 Pesetas.

THOMPSON, REV. NEWTON, S.T.D., *A Harmony of the Gospels* (St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder Book Co. 1942). Pp. xiii, 230. $2.50.

A harmony of the Gospels is needful for the satisfactory study of the inspired narratives. This fact has been recognized from earliest Christian times. The usefulness of a harmony consists in the arrangement of the narratives as nearly as possible in their order of sequence and in the alignment of the different accounts of the same events in parallel columns for comparison and completeness.

The "Synopsis Evangelica" of Father Prado renders this service, and will be especially helpful to all who use the explanations of the Gospels contained in his "Praelectionum Biblicarum Compendium," vol. 3, *Novum Testamentum* (Madrid, 1942). He follows the same order of events in both books.

The author tells us in his preface that he expressly avoids the discussion of chronological problems. He professes to reserve the study of Gospel chronology to a later work. Nevertheless, the very sequence of events as outlined in his work reveal his opinions on the duration of Christ's public ministry (three and one-fourth years), the determination of the feast of Jn. 5:1 as a Pasch different from that mentioned in Jn. 6:4, the question of Saint John's accounts of the Savior's visits to Jerusalem for the feasts of Tabernacles and the Dedication of the Temple (7:14; 10:22) as distinguished from those references of Saint Luke to the Master's journey to the same city.

The text used is the Latin Vulgate. The words of Christ recorded by only one Evangelist are frequently given in Greek in a parallel column for the greater convenience of professor and student. The Greek text is from Merk's third edition (Rome, 1938). Variant readings of the original text according to other critical editions are placed at the bottom of the page whenever the author deems it necessary or useful.

The entire work is divided into parts, chapters, sections, and at times into even smaller pericopes whenever the length of the passage requires division. The titles clearly and succinctly express the topics contained in the various divisions. The numbers at the right of each section title correspond to the paragraphs of Fr. Prado's Compendium (vol. 3) where the respective portions of the Gospel narrative are explained. The insertion in smaller type of passages similar in content though removed from their context is helpful for comparison. The indices, the map of Palestine (p. 14), and the "Horologium evangelicum" reveal the practical outlook of the professor and greatly

enhance the usefulness of his work. Since the book will, without doubt, be used by many more than those who follow Fr. Prado's text books of Scripture study, additional aids for the student would have rendered the "Synopsis Evangelica" even more serviceable.

Readers of Father Fillion's *Life of Christ* will welcome an arrangement of the Gospels which they can use as a companion to the study of this celebrated work. Father Thompson has furnished us with this companion in his "Harmony of the Gospels." The usefulness of this book, however, is curtailed by the employment of the Challoner-Rheims version a year after the revision of this text had been published under the patronage of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

STEPHEN HARTDEGEN, O.F.M.

JOSEPH C. PLUMPE, *Mater Ecclesia*, An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1943). Pp. xxi, 149; 4 plates. $2.00.

The purpose of this scholarly and readable monograph is to trace the history and development of the concept of the Church as *Mother* from its earliest beginnings to the early fourth century. In his foreword, the author notes the popularity of the concept, calling attention to its use in Papal documents, in Catholic devotional literature, in the utterances of scholars and distinguished men, in poetry and novels, and even in heretical writings. His monograph, therefore, is not a mere exercise of scientific pedantry but bears an intimate relation to the life and activity of the Church.

His opening chapter deals with the scriptural prototypes of the concept and with contemporary pagan-gnostic analogies. Why these unrelated topics were lumped together is not clear. We, also, confess that we are not quite satisfied with the treatment accorded to the scriptural prototypes. We warn the reader, however, that this is but a very minor part of the work and that it would be quite unfair and ungracious to judge the whole by the defects of a subordinate section.

First of all, Osee is treated rather summarily: his marriage with the woman of lustful proclivities is completely passed over (1:2-13; 3:1-5), and the beautiful passage relating to God's reconciliation with His unfaithful spouse is forgotten (2:14-23). Similarly, a number of important passages in Isaias concerned with Mother Sion are unaccountably omitted (49:14; 50:3; 54:1-10; 60:4,5). In connection with Jeremias, the touching words of 2:2 should have been mentioned. As for Ezechiel, why was the allegory of the two sisters transmitted (23:1ff.)? Among the references to the Apocalypse we miss the woman clothed with the sun (12:1ff.). Finally, the author relies exclusively on the LXX, without referring to the original at all; this seems inexcusable.

The reader, however, will find more than ample compensation for these scriptural flaws in the bulk of the book. The author leads us with sure and discriminating guidance through the maze of early Christian literature. In the second chapter he shows how the concept of the Church as Mother was anticipated in the Christian writings of the second century. In the subsequent chapters the doctrine on *Mater Ecclesia* of such spiritual leaders as Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, Cyprian, and Methodius of Philippi is thoroughly and competently analyzed. In the Retrospect, the author attempts to determine the place where the practice of regarding and calling the Church *Mother* must have originated. He also endeavors to account for the fact that the idea of the Church as *Mother* did not find a ready welcome in early Christian Rome.

We are duly grateful to Dr. Plumpe for this learned and judicious book. Historians, ecclesiologists, archeologists, and even scriptural students will find it useful. They will be aided by the four special indexes and the general index provided by the author. The select bibliography is also deserving of special mention. Four well executed plates of records pertaining to *Mater Ecclesia* lend additional distinction and value to this able monograph.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

JAMES MOFFATT, *The Thrill of Tradition* (New York: Macmillian, 1944). $2.00.

In six chapters Christian tradition is considered in its history and in its value for believers. These two topics are intermingled, though the first four chapters are mainly historical. At the start general ideas are given about tradition as including tenets, rites, and usages handed down through a long period and exerting vital force that is a protection against the exaggerations of new ideas or methods. Plato's notion of tradition as oral teachings is analyzed, and the use of traditions is traced among the ancient Jews, Latin Stoics, and the mystery cults down into the later Jewish traditions about the Bible and into Islam's traditions for the Quran. In these last two it amounts to oral explanation and application of the ideas contained in a sacred book. The second chapter passes on to the early days of Christianity when the tremendous events in the life and resurrection of Jesus roused the people and produced the books of the New Testament in a way somewhat paralleled in literature by the outburst of literary activity in the ages of Pericles, Elizabeth, Louis Quatorze, and Augustan. The New Testament writings were accompanied by oral tradition explaining them or adding to them from the experiences or interpretations of the first witnesses and their disciples. In the third chapter the succeeding generations are touched very lightly,

the usual Fathers being cited as defenders of tradition, and a transition being noted in the substitution of creeds or commentaries for the direct use of the Bible. The title of the fourth chapter is 'The "New Trent Religion,"' and this title sufficiently indicates the manner of treatment. The great council is represented as substituting its own beliefs and practices for the real tradition of Christianity, and the reformers are pictured as heroic souls eager to free religion from the bonds put upon it by narrowminded churchmen. The concluding chapters touch briefly on the time after Trent and are mostly given up to praising tradition as a constructive power and to trying to define the way in which it should be used so as to conserve its good elements without letting it interfere with proper development along new lines.

The book is based on the Protestant theory that no supreme teaching is to be admitted in the Church, since the exercise of authority destroys the liberty of the soul, which in Christians is to be ruled only by the Spirit. It is a Protestant's appeal to his fellow Protestants to respect their tradition, and a Protestant's confession of his fear of Rome, the center of Christian authority and the historic defender of Christian tradition in its proper sense. Appeal and confession are closely linked, since the bond of unity among Protestants and the chief feature of their tradition as such is their hostility to the Catholic Church. A smug superiority marks Dr. Moffatt's treatment of the great men of Catholic history such as Augustine, Aquinas, Bellarmine, and Franzelin. As he encounters them in his sketches of history he rarely fails to select some flaw that he thinks he finds in them so that he may belittle their achievements. But the full revelation of his bias comes in the chapter on the Council of Trent. His remark on the canon may be taken as a sample of his method; he says (p. 86) that the council retained the full canon "because some of the deuterocanonical books had become specially important for certain beliefs and rites of the Latin Church." Both the history of the proceedings of the council and the explicit statement in its decree show that Trent was following tradition in proclaiming its canon. The Vulgate contained the books rejected or put into second place by Protestants, and the Vulgate was to be retained because of its sanction by long use in the church.

This respect for tradition is not in line with either the origin or the development of Protestantism. It would have been held as the most fundamental heresy by the older school of Protestant who, as Dr. Moffatt acknowledges, instead of being thrilled by tradition were accustomed to shudder at it and denounce it. They tried to stand with Luther in claiming that the Bible alone is the rule of faith and conduct. But they were never comfortable in this stand, since they

could not find any support for it in the Bible nor could they learn from the Bible what books should be considered as belonging to it. It would be interesting to trace the ways in which they tried to evade the Catholic attacks on their unreasonable tenet and to prevent the people from applying it in such a manner as to make every individual a pope in his own right. One way that became popular was to try to set the early Fathers and councils in opposition to the tradition of the Church in later centuries and to assert that Protestants were upholding the early and only true tradition of Christianity. But this proved futile as it either led to the Catholic Church or introduced new disputes among themselves.

Modern Protestants are so befuddled by the rationalistic criticism which has practically taken the Bible away from them as a source of reliable argument that they have begun to feel that their only course is to make tradition their chief defense. Drifting along in the current of the modern form criticism, they are making even the Bible the mere product of traditions that sprung up in the early Christian communities, so that all they really have left is what they imagine to have been these early traditions. In effect, though not yet in explicit statement, this means a repudiation of the Bible as an independent source of revelation since the Bible is simply written tradition and that tradition is not the binding teaching of appointed witnesses, but the residue from countless vague and often contradictory units of tradition without authoritative control in the minds of the early disciples after the Resurrection or, for those who now discard the evidence for the Resurrection, after the Passion.

When Dr. Moffatt essays to lay down rules for evaluating tradition, he is entangled in the same difficulties that proved the undoing of the first Protestants. As they stood on the Bible alone and left its interpretation to private judgment, so he urges men to stand also on tradition, but that tradition is to be tried at the bar of each individual's reason. This is called freedom, but it is really license, and here it leads to even worse confusion and disunity than did private interpretation of the Bible, since the written word was something of a check on fantasy, but tradition is less defined and can more readily be twisted to suit one's wishes. What Protestants need is not more freedom but the voice of authority to bring them back to the full knowledge of Christian truth. The commission given to the apostles was to teach, not to float along with the private opinions of their hearers, and that authoritative teaching was to continue with the help of the Holy Spirit till the end of the world. That authoritative teaching is found only in the Catholic Church, which, as the council of Trent affirms, draws the truths of revelation from both the Scriptures and tradition. But Protestants shudder at the thought of Rome and con-

tinue to bend the knee before their idol of false human freedom. As soon as a man knows that God has spoken, his freedom on that matter is lost; he must either believe on the authority of God or suffer the fate of unbelievers.

WILLIAM A. DOWD, S.J.

MCCOWN, CHESTER C., *The Ladder of Progress in Palestine* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943). Pp. xvi, 387. $3.50.

This volume is a clear and interesting presentation of the results of archeological work in Palestine from the modern beginnings of that science. It gives in cross-section the side-lights cast by archeology on most stages of human existence from the Old Stone Age to the recent past; Palestine is an excellent laboratory for such a study, since within its limited confines it embraces the remains of apparently continuous habitation by a variety of peoples from early prehistoric times to our own. This view of the country's past and of archeology's function in interpreting it is that given central emphasis by the author, for whom "His [the modern archeologist's] dominant interest is in social evolution" (p. 3).

The product of such an interest is in no sense a manual of biblical archeology; it has a different, and a decided merit of its own. For the student of the Holy Scriptures it furnishes background material, with an occasional direct bearing on his personal field of study. It will fit his knowledge of Old and New Testament times into a wider chronological and cultural framework; at the same time, it will not have the breadth of application to the biblical text that would immediately be secured by bringing into focus the parallel achievements of archeology in any one of several countries beyond the confines of Palestine—say, Syria or Egypt.

For one period, the treatment of Palestine itself is disappointing. The author has imbibed that curious spirit whereby it becoms something very like a manifestation of piety to profess diffidence or disdain for sites customarily associated with the earthly life of Christ. Père Vincent is given the usual tribute for his knowledge of Palestinian pottery; but when it comes to the question of the evidence for the *Lithostrotos* (cf. *Revue Biblique* 42, 1933, 83-113; 46, 1937 563-70), we are assured that the problem is archeologically insoluble. The courtyard under the Sisters of Sion Convent certainly belongs to the Antonia; but Pilate may or may not have used it as his praetorium, since "No one has recorded his choice." The clues provided by St. John's Gospel are thus rated at zero and passed over in silence. Similarly, the pool known to us as "Bethsaida" is not discussed at all; the Church of St. Ann, in connection with which such a pool is shown, turns up in the index to the book only because it is marked on a plan

outlining various north walls of Jerusalem. The question of the site of the Holy Sepulchre is not prejudged, though its presentation is sharply different in tone from so recent a statement as that of J. M. Crowfoot in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* for 1933, pp. 58-60. However, the author does voice the opinion that "If there were no interests vested in the present site, it is unlikely that so much ink would be spilled over it." This is ungracious and untrue. If there were no traditional site for the Holy Sepulchre, every Christian archeologist whose profession brought him to Jerusalem would still concern himself with the question of its location; and did he for some obscure reason wish to abstain from doing so, countless other Christians would force the question upon him. For some of these, facile imputations of an unworthy motive would be impossible. The ink spilled by Professor McCown himself shows thus much. By contrast, there is the overstatement, "The questions as to both the why and the when of the fall of Jericho have been answered" (p. 68).

There is an index of biblical citations which is surprisingly short and in fact incomplete. It is, however, the fact that only four New Testament passages are referred to (2 Cor. 11:32, p. 301, not in index) and of these only one is from the Gospels. The book maintains a high standard of typographical excellence and accuracy of detail; the illustrations are copious and excellent, and the end papers are convenient topographical maps of pre-Christian Palestine and Palestine in Christian times.

PATRICK W. SKEHAN

Contemporary Thinking About Jesus. An Anthology. Compiled by Thomas S. Kepler, Professor of Religion, Lawrence College (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944). Pp. 429. $3.50.

"This anthology has one purpose: to give to its readers the privilege of communing with a galaxy of scholars about Jesus," writes the compiler in the preface. Owing to space limitations, excerpts from only fifty-five scholars could be given, "whereas probably twice that number deserve a place." About one half of the selectees are American professors, and no two selections are taken from the same writer. The book is divided into five parts, but only the third and the fifth deal more or less directly with Jesus. The first and the second fall rather under Gospel criticism or Introduction to the Gospels; the fourth contains twelve different views on the eschatology and the sociology of the Gospels. An appendix provides the reader with brief biographies of all the authors quoted, each with a "sentence appraisal."

In trying to evaluate an anthology of this kind, the reviewer naturally asks himself two questions: What is the purpose of the antholo-

gy? Are the authors chosen representative? He might also ask himself if the selected passages are representative of each author's work; but this being a secondary issue, it need not detain us.

Now the purpose of this anthology, to understand Jesus better, is most laudable. So is the method by which it is achieved, and which is thus amplified in the preface: "to understand Jesus best, we must talk to one another about him, we must share scholarly appreciations, we must pool our interpretative results." A squarely modern approach. One might suggest that meditating on the four Gospels and living up to its ideals would, absolutely speaking, be a better method for understanding Jesus; the saints of the Catholic Church used it and succeeded admirably; but it is probably looked down upon as too primitive today or too paradoxical, and is better left to pious monks and nuns.

Unfortunately, the compiler limited his choice of "scholarly appreciations" and "interpretative results" to contemporaries (more or less). Why? Have they a special charism for interpreting the Gospels and appreciating Jesus? Some few years ago, G. Pfannmüller, a Protestant like Kepler, published a similar anthology about Jesus, but culled his selections from all ages of Christianity, even from the thoroughly Catholic middle ages. In the anthology under review not a single passage is included from a Catholic writer. Yet, without hearking back to the Fathers or to the seraphic minnesingers of the middle ages, there is no earthly reason why the compiler could not have quoted some inspiring pages from L. de Grandmaison's third volume of "Jesus Christ." Of other contemporary Catholics who deserved a place, we may mention: Fillion, Meschler, Goodier, Lebreton, Adam, Lagrange, Willam, Reatz, Fouard; they have all written extensively on the life of Jesus, and some of them are universally recognized as authorities also on the questions indirectly connected with it.

Not all the actual selectees are of equal renown. Some are scarcely known beyond a limited circle of readers. Outstanding are the following ten: Major, Harnack, Case, Bacon, R. H. Lightfoot, Guignebert, McCown, Cadoux, Montefiore, and Schweitzer. Yet they are all known as rationalists or modernists or liberal Protestants. What Catholic, or for that matter, what convinced Lutheran or Presbyterian or Episcopalian would care to commune with them for the purpose of understanding Jesus better? And seeing that no two of them agree on fundamental issues, how can their "scholarly appreciations" of Jesus bring to us a finer estimate of His grandeur and significance? On the other hand, if the estimate was to be "comprehensive," why did the compiler exclude radicals like Wellhausen, Drews, W. B. Smith,

Robertson, Couchoud? Did he feel that the line must be drawn somewhere?

This anthology is certainly not recommended to Catholics; they can get a much finer appreciation of Jesus by making the Stations of the Cross or by paying a visit to the Blessed Sacrament or by reading a chapter from Thomas a Kempis. New Testament scholars who are unfamiliar with the literature here utilized, may find occasional passages which throw light on the confused thinking about Jesus and the Gospels so prevalent among contemporaries outside the Catholic Church.

A. C. COTTER, S.J.

ROGER MAC VEAGH AND THOMAS B. COSTAIN, *Joshua* (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1943). Pp. vii, 310. $3.00.

This book, which is advertised as a realistic biography, is an attempt to popularize the life of Joshua from a purely naturalistic viewpoint. The authors believe that the Bible is a collection of legend, folklore and history (p. 18), that the Book of Joshua has been the result of many redactions along the lines of the Graf-Wellhausen theory (p. 70 f.), that the crossing of the Jordan was a wet-fording before the spring flood crest passed the Jabbok (p. 91 ff.), that the walls of Jericho fell because of a perfect sapping operation (p. 131 ff.), etc. Besides inconsistent usage of both Yahweh and Jehovah in the same book, the bibliography contains much that is irrelevant to the subject matter discussed in the book.

JOHN E. STEINMUELLER

CHARLES T. FRITSCH, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943). Pp. v, 81.

This sane and carefully documented book will be found helpful in the textual criticism of the Greek Pentateuch and in the study of post-exilic Jewish theology. As is well known, the Pentateuch occasionally pictures God figuratively as having a human form and as experiencing human emotions. Moreover, it attributes thoughts and actions to God which a subsequent over-scrupulous generation of Jewish theologians deemed derogatory to His dignity, honor, and character. These stylistic peculiarities of the Pentateuch are defined by the author as its anthropomorphisms. The means used by the Septuagint translators to remove or moderate these concrete representations of the deity are termed the anti-anthropomorphisms of the LXX.

The author notes that they have hitherto been but imperfectly classified and for this reason improperly evaluated. His purpose is to supply this twofold deficiency. The utility of the book will be best appreciated if we give an analysis of its contents.

The introductory chapter briefly reviews some of the anthropomorphisms of the Pentateuch and the efforts made by the inspired writers and the scribes to present the deity in more spiritual terms. The first chapter is devoted to the literary devices employed by the LXX to avoid a literal translation of such terms as man, face, eyes, ears, mouth, nostril, and hand when applied to God. The second chapter discusses the manner in which the ideas of repentance, anger, rest, refreshment, and fear, when attributed to God, were rendered by the LXX. The third shows how the name of God was at times altered to escape from any irreverence to God. The fourth reveals that the LXX consistently strove not to describe God as meeting man or as dwelling in some place. The fifth enumerates examples in which the LXX purposely and definitely tones down expressions which may seem to disparage the majesty and honor of God. In the sixth chapter we see how grammatical constructions were occasionally changed to present a more abstract conception of the deity. The seventh chapter cites instances where circumlocutions were used to emphasize the transcendence of God. The eighth records the efforts made by the LXX to soften certain expressions relating to sin against God.

A few sentences quoted from the author's conclusion will afford us some idea of the results of his investigation.

> The tendency to spiritualize the conception of God in the LXX by avoiding anthropomorphic expressions was active; it was not strong enough, however, to make itself felt consistently, except in a comparatively few instances (p. 62). The LXX stands at that point where Greek influence begins to make itself manifest in the Jewish religion. The Seventy, however, were restrained by the need of making a faithful translation, and thus did not consistently express their anti-anthropomorphic attitude. This tendency nevertheless is strong enough to give to the LXX a unique character....

There are two excellent appendices. The first compares codex B with A with respect to their anti-anthropomorphic tendencies. The second shows how Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion rendered the anthropomorphic passages of the Hebrew text in comparison with the LXX. An adequate bibliography and an index of biblical passages enhance the value of this commendable piece of research.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

ALBERT E. BAILY. *Daily Life in Bible Times* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943). Pp. xx, 360; Illustrations 112; Maps 4. $3.00.

Imagination is a priceless jewel, if kept in proper bounds.

The author has striven to render "Daily Life in Bible Times" in a popular style using his imagination wheresoever he deemed fit. Whensoever Sacred Scripture and imagination conflicted, imagination took precedence (cf. Foreword, Chaps. VI, IX and XI).

The words of St. Peter may be applied to this work: "This, then, you must understand first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation. For not by will of man was prophecy brought at any time; but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:20-21).

Space will not permit us to answer all questionable parts. We shall rest content in quoting some passages.

1. "There is considerable doubt about the origin of Yahweh who ultimately became the god of Israel" (p. 54).

2. "Evidently the patriarchal religion had not developed the type of character the prophetic story-tellers would have us believe" (p. 55).

3. "The truth is that Solomon was a spendthrift who did not pay his bills. Over a period of years, Hiram of Tyre loaned this royal four-flusher $3,750,000" (p. 179).

4. "In view of the collapse and the depression that followed Solomon's death, this record effectively contradicts Solomon's claim to be a wise man" (p. 180).

5. "Another publicity stunt was to give his children outlandish names. One he called "A-remnant-will-return" (Isa. 7:3); another, "Speeding-is-the-spoil, hastening-is-the-prey" (Isa. 8:3-4); and either a son of his own or of Ahaz he said would be called "God-is-with-us" (Isa. 7:14) (p. 202).

6. "This city was located most strategically for the purpose of Christian propaganda." (p. 290). "The synagogue and the adjoining house of Justus were therefore located very strategically for the purpose of propaganda" (p. 294).

7. "After the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the Church at Ephesus came to be the leading church of the world. Who revived it we do not know, but its members included, by tradition, Timothy and John. This John cannot have been the son of Zebedee but well may have been the beloved disciple who leaned on Jesus' breast at the last supper; or he may have been another John, called "the Elder," the author of the Fourth Gospel and the Three Epistles of John in our New Testament. Whoever the writer, this Fourth Gospel was one of the contributions made by the church of Ephesus to the Church Universal" (p. 310).

8. "Within the space of twenty years there came from the Ephesian Church not only the Gospel and the Letters mentioned above, but the Revelation of John—still another John not related to the other two" (p. 311).

9. "And by way of introduction he himself wrote a covering letter containing what he regarded as the gist of Paul's teaching and pre-

fixed it to the assembled letters of Paul. This circular letter of his exists in our New Testament as the Epistle to the Ephesians, which is not Paul's and was not written to the Church at Ephesus, but was written at Ephesus by an admirer of Paul as part of a publication venture" (p. 312-313).

10. "At least if the late Epistle of 2 Timothy is to be trusted" (p. 317).

11. "Bible Times end with the writing of the last Biblical Book. Second Peter is that book and its date is about 170 A.D." (p. 325).

The work is neither scholarly nor informative, and cannot be recommended.

The best feature of the work is the group of illustrations and maps.

EUGENE SERAPHIN, O.F.M.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Abbey Press, St. Meinrad, Indiana:

Analysis of the New Testament. A Reprint from St. Meinrad Historical Essays. 1944. Pp. 77. .30.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.:

The Saturday and Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary. Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament, Vol. II, Number 3. 1944. Pp. v, 99. $1.50.